

## NEBRASKA.

Louis H. Deaver, Cody.  
August Dickenman, Talmage.  
George C. Fox, Bayard.  
Grover C. Hoback, Nehawka.  
H. P. Wilson, Geneva.

## NEW YORK.

John G. Armsby, Petersburg.  
Arthur C. Dunning, Yorktown Heights.  
Clarence M. Graves, Champlain.  
Dennis P. Hayes, Tupper Lake.  
Asa G. Neff, Downsville.  
William G. Phippin, Red Creek.

## NORTH CAROLINA.

J. J. Farriss, High Point.

## OHIO.

Frederic C. Betts, Williamsport.  
F. B. Biggert, West Jefferson.  
O. C. Reynolds, Peebles.  
Thomas N. Swearingen, Winchester.

## PENNSYLVANIA.

J. L. Davis, Cherry Tree.

## PORTO RICO.

Carlos F. Torregrosa, Aguadilla.

## TEXAS.

Searcy B. Boulware, Hempstead.

## WEST VIRGINIA.

G. A. Porter, Kenova.  
M. J. Wilson, Milton.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, February 3, 1916.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God Almighty, whom we worship as the Father of all souls, how long, oh, how long wilt Thou suffer Thy children to mutilate, murder, and waste each other under the pretext of war to preserve their national liberty and rights! Interpose, oh, we beseech Thee, Thy holy influence to quicken the conscience of the men who are behind the awful holocaust that they may realize the terrible responsibility resting upon them, that their differences may be justly and amicably adjusted by the crucial test of reason, justice, and mercy, that all the world may once more enjoy home, love, and freedom in the fruitful pursuits of peace, and all glory and honor and praise shall be Thine through Him who gave us the new and holy commandment, "That ye love one another as I have loved you." Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## SPEECHES BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed as a House document the speeches which have been made by the President of the United States on his trip through the West.

The SPEAKER. Why not wait until the President gets back and include all of them?

Mr. FOSTER. He will have made his last speech last night or this morning, and I will ask to include that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to print as a House document the speeches made by the President on his trip through the West and those that may be made by him.

Mr. CANNON. I hope that may be done.

Mr. MANN. If the Democratic Members will read them, I am in favor of it.

Mr. FOSTER. I think they will be read generally by the people throughout the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. Reserving the right to object—of course I have no objection to the publication of the speeches by the President, but it is taking a great deal of liberty to ask to print not only speeches made but those that may hereafter be made.

Mr. FOSTER. There have been a good many speeches printed in the RECORD by the extension of remarks.

Mr. BARNHART. I think it would be proper to wait until the others have been made, and then ask permission to print them as a House document.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course it might be done by asking to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BARNHART. I have no desire to object; but it does not seem proper to give consent that speeches made in the future shall be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. FOSTER. The President made his last speech last night or this morning.

Mr. BARNHART. The Speaker put the request for speeches to be made.

Mr. CANNON. That he may make on this trip.

Mr. FOSTER. I think they have all been made now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Reserving the right to object, do I understand the gentleman's request to be that the speeches the President has made up to this time on the western trip be published as a House document?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; I understand he made the last speech this morning at St. Louis.

Mr. MONDELL. I understood the request to include speeches that he might make hereafter.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the gentleman is facetious, he can object if he wants to.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not object; I think the speeches ought to be printed, but it seems to me we ought to have them printed immediately, the speeches that have been made, and not wait for future speeches.

Mr. FOSTER. We are not to wait for them.

Mr. MONDELL. I have no objection; I think they will make an excellent document on the other side of the question.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the gentleman's private opinion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 4954. An act directing the Secretary of War to reconvey a parcel of land to the Anshe Chesed Congregation, Vicksburg, Miss.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following resolutions:

## House concurrent resolution 11.

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),* That the reports of the Alaskan Engineering Commission, in two volumes, for the period from March 12, 1914, to December 31, 1915, inclusive, together with accompanying maps, charts, and profiles, be printed as a House document and that 6,000 additional copies be printed, of which 3,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, 1,500 copies for the use of the Senate, and 1,500 copies for the use of the commission.

## House concurrent resolution 13.

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),* That there be printed and bound in cloth 100,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of the Horse, the same to be first revised and brought to date under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, 70,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives and 30,000 for use of the Senate.

## House concurrent resolution 14.

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),* That there be printed and bound in cloth 100,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of Cattle, the same to be first revised and brought to date, under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, 70,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives and 30,000 copies for use of the Senate.

## AMENDING HOUSE RULE.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution from the Committee on Rules.

The Clerk read as follows:

## House resolution 122.

*Resolved,* That the standing rules of the House of Representatives be, and they are hereby, amended in the following manner, to wit:

In Rule X insert a new paragraph to read as follows:

"54b. On flood control, to consist of 15 members."

In Rule XI insert a new paragraph to read as follows:

"54b. To flood control, other than appropriations therefor, to the committee on flood control."

Mr. SPARKMAN rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Florida rise?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I rise to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if there will be any discussion on this resolution?

Mr. GARRETT. Yes; there is to be discussion. Let me inquire of the gentleman from Kansas as to the matter of time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What suggestion has the gentleman from Tennessee to make?

Mr. GARRETT. We are willing to go ahead pretty rapidly.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have very little time demanded on the rule itself. I suggested to some gentlemen on the other side of the House last night that I would probably have some time that I could yield them; they had asked for time in which to discuss flood conditions in their districts, and it was stated that such discussion could be had under this rule.

Mr. GARRETT. That was the statement made publicly yesterday.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a parliamentary question. I had leave of absence for two years and I do not know what was done in that time. I recall that when I had the honor to preside on this Calendar Wednesday that it was so holy—

A MEMBER. This is Thursday.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I beg the gentleman's pardon. I have been watching other matters and I have dropped a stitch. I suppose, without further remark, I ought to say that my losing track of the day is due to the sorrows of a poor old wicked devil. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. GARRETT. Remembering the ruling which the gentleman from Illinois made, we carefully refrained from calling this resolution up on Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. CANNON. Yes; Calendar Wednesday was so holy that nothing could interfere with it but Calendar Wednesday business. It is still holy, is it?

Mr. GARRETT. So far. Now, the gentleman from Kansas and myself are both for this rule.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes; there will be no discussion on the rule itself, I think, for I do not know of any opposition to the rule.

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] is opposed to the rule.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will say frankly that I am not entirely opposed to it. I have some views that I would like to express.

Mr. GARRETT. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would say 15 minutes would answer my purpose.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the gentleman proceed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for one hour.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous report from the Committee on Rules. It provides that the standing rules of the House be amended so as to create a new standing committee and to define the jurisdiction of that committee. The committee to be created is to be entitled the committee on flood control, and in that part of the resolution which defines its jurisdiction it is recited that all matters referring to flood control shall be referred to this committee.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. Let me finish the preliminary statement. The Committee on Rules has recognized the tremendous importance of this subject matter, and that committee has felt that there should be created a standing committee of the House which could give scrutiny and attention to that question, that committee having jurisdiction of that subject matter only and, therefore, has reported unanimously this resolution with the recommendation that it pass. I yield now to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask the gentleman in view of the language of the latter part of the resolution, "54b. To flood control, other than appropriations therefor, to the Committee on Flood Control," whether it would not be well to amend the resolution, in line 8, by saying "To flood control and the drainage of swamp and overflowed lands," because "flood control" may not necessarily include a very important element, in my opinion, and that is the drainage of overflowed land.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, that would be broadening the idea which the Committee on Rules had in mind when it reported this resolution. As a matter of fact, I should assume that bills touching that question would be referred to this committee, whether it is provided in the rule or not.

Mr. BORLAND. I thought the gentleman was going to reply that he thought the words "flood control" broad enough; but if he replies that my suggestion would broaden the meaning of the words as the committee used them, then I think an amendment is certainly necessary, because it seems to me that the drainage of overflowed lands being so nearly related to flood control and yet being not necessarily directly included in it, ought to be included within the functions of this committee. There is no other committee to which that matter could appropriately go. It could not appropriately go to the Agricul-

tural Committee and certainly not to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, perhaps I may have been unhappy in my expression in reply to the gentleman's first inquiry, but in the latter part of my inquiry I think I made it clear. I think certainly that all bills of the character mentioned by the gentleman would be referred to this committee.

Mr. BORLAND. Then the gentleman would have no objection to such an amendment? I should like very much to urge the amendment. I do not think there ought to be any substantial objection to it.

Mr. GARRETT. I would prefer not to include those words. I think it would not be proper to include them at this time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to direct the gentleman's attention to the phraseology, more from a grammatical standpoint than anything else. I have considered the rules with this new rule inserted, and find that the reading will be rather awkward. I assume the gentleman intends, so far as the last provision is concerned, to insert it immediately following "54a"; 54a begins as the gentleman will note "To matters relating to the construction or maintenance of roads other than appropriations therefor, to the Committee on Roads"; 54b would come right after that and it would say, "To flood control, other than appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Flood Control." I would suggest that in order to make it in harmony with the previous section that after the word "to" there be inserted "matters relating to."

Mr. GARRETT. If the gentleman will turn back of 54a and read the other provisions, he will find this language to which he refers is in harmony with all of the other provisions, and that 54a itself is the grammatical exception to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. STAFFORD. I direct the gentleman's attention to the wording in section 53, "All proposed legislation concerning the disposition of useless papers, to the joint committee, and so forth." Now, it is sought to make a subdivision of section 54. Section 54 is as follows:

All proposed legislation concerning the census and the apportionment of representatives; to the Committee on the Census.

The House at the last Congress incorporated a new provision, section 54a, in which it was provided that matters relating to the construction or maintenance of roads should be referred to the Committee on Roads.

If the gentleman is going to have phraseology in consonance with that subsection of which this is a part the language should be similar. To throw into this section of the rule following 54a such language, "54b. To flood control, other than the appropriations therefor, to the committee on flood control," is rather awkward in the extreme. The gentleman should certainly frame it in some language harmonious with the prefatory part of section 54a. I will ask the gentleman whether the committee considered that, because I think it is worthy of consideration.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, that was considered, I will say to the gentleman. If the gentleman will turn to page 287 of the book I have in hand now—the pages may be different—at the beginning of Rule XI it provides:

All proposed legislation shall be referred to the committee named by the preceding rule as follows, namely: Subjects relating, first, to the election of Members—

And so on. And in subsection 39 it runs in exactly that language. The proposition which the gentleman suggests was considered and it was thought that we had adopted the simplest and plainest language that could be adopted.

Mr. STAFFORD. The only criticism that can be lodged against that position is that in the sections following section 37 there is language that does not conform. If that were the rule throughout, the position of the gentleman might be well taken, but in section 54 and section 53 there is adopted different language. Those sections begin with the phrase, "All proposed legislation concerning." Now, section 54a, which the gentleman reported, adopts new language, "To matters relating to the construction and maintenance of roads." To be in harmony with that I insist the gentleman should follow that language, otherwise there is nothing to connect it except that at the very beginning. Here we have interposed a section which has been disjointed by the intervening language that varies with the original phraseology.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, with all possible deference to my friend, who I know studies these matters very carefully, I do not think there will be any trouble about the meaning of this rule if it be adopted.

Mr. STAFFORD. There would be no question about the meaning, but it will be very awkward.



Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARRETT. I will.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I notice the rule provides for a committee on flood control. I have listened to the gentleman's explanation of the rule, but I do not think he went sufficiently into detail to give the House full information as to what he thinks constitutes flood control. I will illustrate the question by stating what I have in mind: For instance, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors at present has charge of the Mississippi River for all the purposes of navigation.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I assume the discussion now going on on the other side of the aisle is of importance to the House and I should like to hear it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, within certain limitations the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House has had charge of the improvement of the lower Mississippi River, appropriating large sums of money each year, and the language appropriating these amounts is always so guarded as to confine the improvement of the river to the building of levees, to protect against floods, of course, and for the purposes of navigation. What I want to ask is, What effect would this rule, if adopted, or this amendment to the rules and the appointment of this committee under it, have on the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors over that class of work?

Mr. GARRETT. I should say, Mr. Speaker, that bills relating to flood control would be referred to this new committee if the rule be adopted. I do not think that those bills which refer to the question of the navigation of the Mississippi would be referred to this new committee, but that they would be referred, as they have always been since the Committee on Rivers and Harbors was created, to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then the gentleman is of the opinion that if we make an appropriation, as we are likely to do, for the improvement of the Mississippi River below Cairo, using the same language we have been using heretofore, providing that the amount shall be expended in the building of levees and the revetment of banks, and so forth, so far as, in the opinion of the Secretary of War or Chief of Engineers, may be necessary for the purposes of navigation, it would not be subject to a point of order if this committee be created?

Mr. GARRETT. I think not; that is my personal opinion.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. GARRETT. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman has stated what the rule proposed to do. Now, will the gentleman state why it is proposed to do that? What is the reason for taking part of the jurisdiction away from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and creating a special committee?

Mr. GARRETT. Because of the realization of the fact on the part of the Committee on Rules that there are aspects of the question of flood control which are not related to either navigation or commerce.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. I do.

Mr. STERLING. I would like to get at the idea of the gentleman as to the duties of this committee. The same question may have been asked by some of those other gentlemen over there, but I have not been able to get any information. Does this relate to the prevention of floods and matters pertaining to the avoiding of floods or does it pertain to matters of relief in emergencies such as exist at the present time in some parts of the Mississippi Valley, or both?

Mr. GARRETT. Of course it would pertain to both, and, having no appropriating power, I should say this committee could not do much on the question of immediate relief.

Mr. SHERLEY. May I ask the gentleman another question?

Mr. GARRETT. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. To what committee would the power to appropriate on matters authorized by this committee go?

Mr. GARRETT. To the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SHERLEY. On what theory is that advanced? The present Committee on Rivers and Harbors has appropriating power over this subject matter. Now, you do not take that away by any express statement.

Mr. GARRETT. What I mean is that if this committee which is thus created should bring in a bill and that bill should be enacted into law providing for a continuing contract, that would necessarily, under the rules of the House as they now stand, go to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am just trying to get the facts that are involved in this proposition before the House. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman, but I think that statement ought to have been made. Now, going back to my previous inquiry, is it not true that every committee of the House, dealing with any

particular subject matter, has to necessarily deal with a lot of things that are collateral to it, and that the reason advanced would apply to practically every big committee's jurisdiction?

Mr. GARRETT. That is an abstract principle.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I desire to ask the gentleman if the Irrigation Committee could not take care of nearly all the items that are presented, for the reason that these dams and ditches on the heads of all these streams could hold the water and the ditches in the Irrigation Service could keep the water cut off the swamps on the lower part of the river?

Mr. GARRETT. I do not think so, Mr. Speaker. I do not think the subjects are related at all.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. If the gentleman will permit me to make a statement there, I have in mind one great project in the Indian Service, known as the Yakima irrigation scheme, under the supervision both of the United States Government and the Indian Service—the reclamation laws of the United States. The two matters can not be separated. You have two committees at work on the same reservation, one putting water on the upper part of the reservation, flooding the lower part of the reservation, and one now making appropriation to take the water away from the lower part of the reservation.

Mr. GARRETT. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that I presume it will be impossible to have a committee whose jurisdiction with some other committee of the House might not at some time seem to cross. But I do not think that the Committee on Irrigation could possibly deal with the questions that are presented and that will be referred to the committee on flood control, if it be created.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I am aware that there are some very large rivers that would not come under this rule.

Mr. STERLING. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. Just a moment. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Speaker? I want to treat these gentlemen fairly.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 40 minutes remaining.

Mr. STERLING. I would like to ask just one question.

Mr. GARRETT. Certainly.

Mr. STERLING. The Government has done considerable work in view of preventing floods. What committee had jurisdiction over that work? Was it the Committee on Rivers and Harbors?

Mr. GARRETT. To what work does the gentleman refer?

Mr. STERLING. I think they have appropriated money for building levees, have they not?

Mr. GARRETT. The levees to which the gentleman refers have always been built on the theory that they were in the interest of navigation, and the Committee on Rivers and Harbors had jurisdiction of that—that is, if the gentleman refers to the Mississippi River levees.

Mr. STERLING. I do refer to that, and many others that have been built.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman will not overlook the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River that has been in existence for many years without a meeting.

Mr. GARRETT. The Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River never had jurisdiction while I was a member of it. I cut my eyeteeth in that committee, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LONGWORTH and Mr. STERLING rose.

The SPEAKER. To whom will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STERLING].

Mr. STERLING. This rule would take away from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors the jurisdiction it has exercised in the past on the question of levees?

Mr. GARRETT. It would not take away jurisdiction of any question affecting navigation or commerce.

Now, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH].

Mr. LONGWORTH. That was about the question I was going to ask the gentleman. I could not hear the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN], the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors; but what I wanted to know was precisely how much jurisdiction this would actually take away from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. GARRETT. I can only repeat the answer which I made to the gentleman from Illinois, that it will not, in my opinion, take away the jurisdiction of any question affecting directly navigation or commerce.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARRETT. Certainly.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is the gentleman able to state whether the adoption of this rule will facilitate or retard expenditures from the Public Treasury?

Mr. GARRETT. I did not get the gentleman's question.  
Mr. FITZGERALD. I asked, will it facilitate or retard the getting of appropriations? [Laughter.]

Mr. GARRETT. I can not tell about that until the bills come in. The rule itself carries no appropriation.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GARRETT. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I ask whether I am correct in assuming that this resolution was introduced on the day before yesterday and that that was the first knowledge the House had of the proposition to create this committee? Is that correct?

Mr. GARRETT. It was introduced day before yesterday, as I recall it.

Mr. TREADWAY. And I understand the Committee on Rules reports it back now and expects that the House will at once act pro or con on the subject?

Mr. GARRETT. No; the Committee on Rules reported it back yesterday. It is now before the House for consideration, and it is expected that the House will act pro or con to-day.

Mr. TREADWAY. At once?

Mr. GARRETT. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I ask, Mr. Speaker, since it is a new subject, sprung so quickly, without opportunity for consideration either on the part of the committees that will be affected by it or of the House as a whole, that in deference to the Members considering the subject it might not take a later place on the calendar and be brought up at a future day? Or is it introduced with the idea that it is so important that it must be acted upon immediately?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the report of the committee is before the House. I do not know whether I can answer the question of the gentleman from Massachusetts or not. It has certainly been a much-agitated question for a long while. The Committee on Rules has considered it.

Now I desire to yield some time to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL]. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I wish the gentleman would yield and take care of some gentlemen on that side, and then I will take the floor in my own right and yield to some gentlemen here.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY], reserving, of course, my right to resume the floor.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman does that, will he yield to a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GARRETT. I had yielded. If the gentleman will pardon me, there are a number of gentlemen wanting time now, since this matter has risen. I wonder if we can not agree upon some time for debate now. I shall be very glad, indeed, to yield if I can, if there is any desire for time. If not, of course, I shall have to retain the floor, and move the previous question at the end of the hour.

The SPEAKER. What does the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] say?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, the demand for time is growing on this side. I promised 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TAYLOR], and I think we had better run on for a limited time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on this resolution shall conclude in 1 hour and 30 minutes; 30 minutes of that time to be controlled by myself, 30 minutes by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], and 30 minutes by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN], and that at the end of that time the previous question may be considered as ordered.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I have requests for more than 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. What does the gentleman suggest?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I suggest an hour on a side.

Mr. GARRETT. I am endeavoring, Mr. Speaker, to arrange the time so that those who, as I understand, are opposed to the rule may have control of some time. I am perfectly willing to agree to an hour on a side.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. In just a moment, and I will yield out of that hour 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] if the gentleman from Kansas will yield 10 minutes to him.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I will yield to some one who is opposed to the rule, if there is anyone on this side.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is the gentleman in favor of the rule?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Apparently, then, some one ought to be represented in opposition. I want to secure some information.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have 10 minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is my position. I would like to get 10 minutes.

Mr. HULBERT. I desire to get 10 minutes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has no control of it.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, if we can get order for a few moments—

Mr. CAMPBELL. The gentleman from Tennessee suggested an hour and thirty minutes, to be divided 30 minutes to myself, 30 minutes to himself, and 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida. I have suggested an hour, to be divided between the gentleman from Tennessee and myself, and I will give 10 minutes of that time to any gentleman on this side who is opposed to the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman's suggestion one hour from the present time?

Mr. CAMPBELL. No; one hour each.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important matter. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee may have an hour, or 45 minutes, as he desires—

Mr. GARRETT. That will be sufficient—

Mr. MANN. And the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] 45 minutes, and the gentleman from Florida 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee shall have 45 minutes at his disposal, and the gentleman from Kansas 45 minutes at his disposal, and the gentleman from Florida 45 minutes at his disposal.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I merely want to ask whether I can have 10 minutes from any one of these three gentlemen?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, if we can get order for a moment, I will undertake to ascertain how many gentlemen here desire time.

Mr. SMALL. I desire some time.

Mr. MANN. The whole House desires time.

Mr. GARRETT. I do not propose to lose control of the floor. If we can not reach an agreement, of course, I shall have to move the previous question. If we can just have a moment to see how much time is desired, I will undertake to submit a proposition. In the meantime will the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] find out how much time is desired on that side?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I modify my request to make it an hour to each one of three gentlemen, and that at the end of that time the previous question shall be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] renews his request for unanimous consent—

Mr. FOSTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I think we will come to an agreement here in a moment.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this resolution may be continued for 2 hours and 30 minutes, 1 hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], 1 hour to be controlled by myself, and half an hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN], and that at the end of that time the previous question shall be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] asks unanimous consent that the debate continue two hours and a half, 1 hour to be controlled by himself, 1 hour by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], 30 minutes by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN]. Is there objection?

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to know whether I can have 10 minutes out of that allotment.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman for or against the resolution?

Mr. SMALL. Against the resolution.

Mr. GARRETT. Then the gentleman can get his time from the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, my present inclination is to favor this resolution; but at the same time, in view of the circumstances, I think the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, Mr. SPARKMAN, should be given more time, and unless he is given the time he wants, I shall object.



Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Washington permit me to say that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] submitted a request to me for 20 minutes, and I voluntarily increased the time to 30 minutes. If the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] desires more time, I shall be very glad to try to arrange it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I think the gentleman from Florida should have sufficient time so that he can yield time to any Members who are opposed to the resolution. I have no doubt that the distinguished gentlemen who have control of the time on either side will deal fairly, but at the same time I think the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] ought to have the time that he wishes. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should think 45 minutes would be sufficient. I find there are more gentlemen who wish to speak on this than I had supposed.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the debate upon this matter may proceed for 2 hours and 45 minutes, 1 hour to be controlled by myself, 1 hour by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], and 45 minutes by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN]; and that at the end of that time the previous question may be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] asks unanimous consent that the debate be limited to 2 hours and 45 minutes, 1 hour to be controlled by himself, 1 hour by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], and 45 minutes by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN]; and that at the end of that time the previous question shall be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] whether in yielding time they are going to divide it impartially, or are they going to give time only to those who favor the resolution?

Mr. GARRETT. I shall yield time indiscriminately to gentlemen, whether they are for or against this resolution.

Mr. MANN. My friend from Washington goes over to the Democratic side of the House to propound that question. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. I hope these Republicans will compose their differences in private. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HULBERT].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HULBERT] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Speaker, I should consider myself remiss in the duty which devolves upon me, representing the constituency I do, which forms a part of the commercial center of the world, located on the largest harbor in the world, dependent as it is, not upon local conditions therein involved, but drawing upon the entire country for the world-renowned supremacy which it enjoys, if I did not avail myself of this opportunity to express the sentiments of the people of my district as favoring the resolution which has been reported. I say that because in every instance when nations, States, or local communities have been stricken by floods or other terrible catastrophes, the people of New York have responded with a commendable promptness to meet the requirements of the situation.

Not so very long ago, at the time of the Galveston flood, trainload after trainload of provisions was gathered at stations established by the sympathetic people of our city and dispatched to the relief of the stricken. That has been repeated with every flood upon the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers, and even in every international disaster of note.

I realize that the conditions involved in these flood times along the Mississippi Valley are so important and extensive that it is impossible for the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, owing to enormous number of matters requiring attention, to give due and adequate consideration to all the elements involved; and for the same reason I feel that it is incumbent upon this House to recognize those conditions wherever they exist throughout this land, as it expands and advances along the pathway of progress, and it is incumbent upon the House to develop accordingly proper conveniences for the administration of national affairs to meet the needs which arise under those conditions.

I should like in this connection to discuss the necessity for a similar resolution, which I propose to introduce at no distant

date, and to have referred to the Committee on Rules, relating to the harbor of New York, where from a commercial standpoint we are just as much affected as are the people of the Mississippi Valley from a humanitarian standpoint. If it were in order for me to do so, I would rise upon the floor of this House and move to discharge the Committee on Rivers and Harbors from the consideration of a bill introduced by me on the 6th of last December, and upon which no action has been taken by the committee. It was intended by this bill to cover the pending and contemplated improvements of New York Harbor. When it is realized that since the administration of Washington down to that of Wilson less than 3 per cent of all the moneys appropriated by Congress for river and harbor improvements has been allotted to the greatest harbor in the world, I hope and believe it will arrest the attention of the Members of the Sixty-fourth Congress in the same serious way as does the resolution which is under consideration at the present time. The improvement of New York Harbor is not a matter local in its nature, but it concerns the people of the entire United States, just as does the Valley of the Mississippi. It belongs to the Nation. It argues its own case, merely requiring my agency as an instrument of presentation; for truth knows no preferences. It seeks no favors and it makes no apologies. It simply demands a hearing.

Approximately one-half of the exports and imports of the United States pass through New York Harbor, and 100,000,000 tons of commerce, if apportioned per capita, making 1 ton for each man, woman, and child in the United States, accommodates every section of this country; and from the merchandise imported through the port of New York more than double the amount of duties is collected and turned into the Federal Treasury than from all other ports of the United States together. And I had almost overlooked the fact and nearly failed to mention that New York State contributed in addition thereto \$17,417,537.60, nearly one-half of the individual income tax, and \$10,221,206.65, or more than one-fourth, of the corporation income tax collected during the year 1915. Do not these facts appeal to your sense of justice in securing your favorable consideration of that which I am now about to submit? The magnitude of New York City's industrial and commercial possessions, its wealth and population, can be comprehended only by comparison. In every decade since 1840 New York has shown a greater numerical increase in population than any other American city. One-thirteenth of the entire population of the United States now lives in the New York metropolitan district. New York City produces one-tenth of the entire manufactured product of the United States, more than any other State except Pennsylvania.

The value of New York's taxable property exceeds that of Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston, and St. Louis combined. New York City banks handle 60 per cent of the clearings of the United States.

New York is the terminus of all but one of the great eastern railroad systems.

Thirty per cent of the entire population of the United States and 42 per cent of all the taxable property lie within 350 miles of New York City. The population in New York City increased since 1900, 47½ per cent. New York manufactures increased between 1900 and 1910, 70 per cent. The foreign commerce of New York increased from 1898 to 1913, 131 per cent. And yet in the improvement of this great harbor the Federal Government has not only failed to keep abreast of the needs of the times but has fallen far in the rear.

I would like to put the New York Harbor situation before you in concrete form:

Improvement.	Adopted.	Appropriated. <sup>1</sup>	Required to complete.	Total.	Commerce.
East River.....	1868	\$6,505,203	\$13,400,000	\$19,905,203	<sup>2</sup> \$1,537,239,286
Hudson River.....	1875	641,479	995,000	1,636,479	<sup>2</sup> 2,559,185,809
Harlem River.....	1879	2,068,000	1,520,656	3,588,656	582,383,757
Newtown Creek.....	1880	525,900	110,000	535,900	147,739,825
Sheepshead Bay.....	1880	44,600	.....	44,600	144,777
Bay Ridge and Red Hook Channel.....	1881	4,421,100	384,000	4,805,100	408,459,300
Bronx River.....	1896	326,500	703,931	1,030,431	<sup>1</sup> 1,947,786
Ambrose Channel.....	1899	7,600,010	140,000	7,640,010	2,056,847,222
Coney Island Channel.....	1907	114,300	.....	114,300	<sup>2</sup> 5,256,300
Jamaica Bay.....	1910	700,500	6,730,000	7,430,500	5,171,668
Harlem or Bronx Kills, recommended.....	1902	Nothing.	1,900,000	1,900,000	<sup>1</sup> None.
		22,947,592	25,683,587	48,631,179	7,304,375,730

<sup>1</sup>Maintenance only.

<sup>2</sup>22,436,151 passengers.

<sup>3</sup>106,263,639 passengers.

<sup>4</sup>Only 14 per cent completed.

<sup>5</sup>1,178,168 passengers.

<sup>6</sup>State Barge Canal not yet open.

In addition to the foregoing evidence, that the improvement of New York Harbor is not a "pork-barrel" proposition, let it be noted that the Ambrose Channel was constructed at a saving of about \$1,500,000; that the balance to be expended, under the old project, for the improvement of the East River—\$2,551,939—can be turned over to, and credited upon, the new project and will suffice to do the work required in the next five years; that the Coney Island Channel improvement was authorized upon an estimate of \$168,300, and work to date, costing only \$114,300, meets present-day needs and no further appropriations have been asked for.

You are now probably asking yourselves what it is that we seek.

In 1868 the first project was adopted for the improvement of New York Harbor, to wit, East River, a tidal strait, of which the world-renowned Hell Gate is a part, about 16 miles long, extending from the Battery to Throg Neck, separating Long Island from the Boroughs of Manhattan and the Bronx, and connecting up New York Bay with the sheltered waters of Long Island Sound, providing a double entrance and exit to New York Harbor, and establishing a marine trench, which will be more efficient in the defense of that portion of the United States, which nearly all military and naval experts agree would be the first objective point of attack, than a dozen battleships, under present conditions, and at the cost of less than one battleship. With its subsequent modifications, this project had for its object extending the depth of the channel over projecting rocks at an estimated cost of \$8,757,183.

Work called for under existing project.

Locality.	Distance by water from the Battery.	Least original depth.	Least present depth.	Projected depth.	Remarks.
	Miles.	Feet.	Feet.	Feet.	
Battery Reef.....		12.8	12.8	26	
South Ferry Reef.....		17	19	26	
Diamond Reef.....		15.7	26	26	Completed.
Reef off Diamond Reef.....		19	26	26	Do.
Coenties Reef.....		14.3	25.5	26	
Third Street Reef.....	3	15.9	26	26	Do.
Shell Reef.....	2½-4	7.5	13	15	
Pilgrim Rock.....	3½	12	24	26	
Twenty-sixth Street Reef.....	4	16.1	26	26	Do.
Charlotte Rock.....	4½	14.7	26	26	Do.
Ferry Reef.....	4½	7	24	26	
Man-of-War Rock.....	4½	+0.8	26	26	Do.
Middle Reef (includes Negro Head, Flood Rock, Hen and Chickens, and Grid-iron). <sup>1</sup>	7½	+6	14.9	26	95 per cent completed.
Heel Tap Rock.....	7½	12.1	20.5	26	
Hallets Point Reef.....	7½	+4	26	26	Completed.
Frying Pan Reef.....	7½	9	23.8	26	
Pot Rock.....	8	8	26	26	Do.
Shell Drake Rock.....	8	8	26	26	Do.
Ways Reef.....	8½	5	26	26	Do.
Rock off Negro Point.....	9			26	Reported completed.
Scaly Rock.....	9½				
Middle Ground. <sup>2</sup>	10	11	17.8	26	
Reef off North Brother Island.	10½	16			
Channel between North Brother and South Brother Islands. <sup>3</sup>	10½-11½	19	19	26	
Baretto Reef.....	11½	17	26	26	Completed.

<sup>1</sup> Under contract for completing removal.

<sup>2</sup> Under contract for part removal.

<sup>3</sup> Under contract for deepening for a width of about 300 feet.

About 70 per cent of the work has been completed.

On March 2, 1912, Col. W. M. Black, United States district engineer at New York, under acts of Congress approved March 2, 1907, and March 3, 1909, submitted a report of the survey of the East River and Hell Gate (H. Doc. 188, 63d Cong., 1st sess.), in which he reported favorably upon an amendment of the project for further improvement at an expense of \$32,533,501, providing for a through channel 35 feet deep, with access to the wharves to a depth of 30 feet, and the improvement of the Harlem or Bronx Kills, to provide a short cut for boats passing from the Harlem, which will be the natural outlet for the State barge canal into the East River; and Little Hell Gate, as a means of reducing the tidal velocities and diminishing, if not avoiding, the consequent dangers at Hell Gate. The Chief of Engineers modified the recommendations of Col. Black by reducing the estimate "for the present" to \$13,400,000, which, largely through the efforts of our late lamented colleague, Col. Joseph A. Goulden, was included in the bill reported by the Rivers and Harbors Committee and passed the House in the Sixty-third Congress, first session, but failed in the Senate. Meanwhile no further appropriations have been made for the

improvement of the East River; and while there is an unexpended balance of \$2,551,939 now of the amount originally authorized, the Chief of Engineers reported in 1914 and again in 1915:

It is believed that the present 26-foot project has been outgrown by the commercial interests involved, and that further work on this project is now economically inadvisable. No estimate is therefore submitted for operations in connection with said project during the fiscal year 1917.

And I may add that nothing has been expended since 1912 upon this great waterway. And if the immediate decisive action is not taken by Congress before we are able to secure the adoption of the modified project for \$13,400,000 "to meet the present demands," it will be then as obsolete as is now the project of 1868; so that by the time we will be able to secure the ultimate adoption of the project for \$33,000,000, as recommended by Col. Black, the commercial interest involved will so far have outgrown the port of New York that it will live only in history. In fact, its commerce is being most seriously interfered with to-day, because the Interstate Commerce Commission has established differential rates against New York, and which, I am told, has diverted enormous shipments of grain and other freight through Canadian and southern ports. I do not believe that the patriotism of our people will sanction discrimination against New York in favor of foreign ports.

The report of the Chief of Engineers adds:

As a result of a careful canvass the commerce of the East River in the calendar year 1914 appears to have amounted to 46,553,605 short tons, valued at \$1,537,239,236, and that the number of passengers carried was 22,436,151.

And the fact that the 30-foot and 31-foot battleships built, and now being built, at the Brooklyn Navy Yard can only be floated in or out on high tide at the rate of one ship per day was recently called to the attention of this House by the Secretary of the Navy, who urged the immediate necessity of this improvement. But it is reported that the Rivers and Harbors Committee will not take on any new projects at this session, which settles the question, unless you gentlemen give us unanimous consent for the consideration of this matter in a separate bill or resolution.

Is there anyone who doubts that the unusual commercial importance of the East River, Harlem River, and the Harlem or Bronx Kills and their continued improvement to meet the insistent demands of the commerce of the metropolis differentiates these to a large degree from any other project; and should not, therefore, the harbor of New York be made a matter of special consideration and not included in the river and harbor bill? Let us take, for instance, the question of the improvement of the Harlem or Bronx Kills.

The rivers and harbors act of June 13, 1902, directed a preliminary examination of the Harlem or Bronx Kills, which was made and reported by Col. Mansfield on July 28, 1902, whose report was reviewed by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and their report, dated November 11, 1903, concludes with the words:

In view of the great present and prospective benefits that would result, it is advisable to undertake the improvement of the Harlem Kills to a depth of 18 feet at mean low water, at a cost of \$1,899,480.

There is a recommendation made 14 years ago, and what has been done meanwhile?

In 1903 the Legislature of the State of New York adopted a project for the improvement of the Erie and connecting canals to a depth of 12 feet, and authorized a bond issue of \$101,000,000 and \$7,000,000, to which have been added by subsequent enactments \$19,000,000 and \$27,000,000, making a total of \$154,000,000 to complete the project and construct terminals. Yet while the people of the State of New York, with far-sighted statesmanship, and appreciating the necessity of this development in order to accommodate the commerce of the great Northwest and to regain that which has been diverted through Canadian ports—and upon the completion of the pending improvements of the Welland Canal even greater will be the competition to the port of New York—have expended upon the development of their interior waterways more than \$200,000,000—that is, a State having 10 per cent of the population of the whole United States have appropriated an amount equal to 25 per cent of that appropriated by the Federal Congress for the whole United States, and yet have been unable to secure the cooperation of the Federal Government in the development of this improvement of the Harlem or Bronx Kills, the importance of which can not be overestimated, because the tremendous tonnage which will be brought from the great Northwest down the State Barge Canal and the Hudson River must be diverted in order to relieve congestion in the lower Hudson River, through the Harlem River, and under present conditions boats intending to go up the East River and Long Island Sound are compelled to continue on their course down to Ninety-first Street and through tortuous Hell Gate, whereas upon the improvement of the Harlem or Bronx Kills



these vessels can cut through between Randalls Island and the mainland, making a saving in distance of approximately 11 miles and avoiding the danger of Hell Gate. Moreover, Col. Black in his report says:

It is considered that this channel would be commercially advantageous in four ways: (1) By assisting in the reduction of the excessive-current velocities in Hell Gate, by permitting more water to pass between the upper East River and the basin about Mill Rock through the lower Harlem River, instead of having to pass through Hell Gate; (2) by affording a direct and short passage to traffic between the upper East River and the Harlem and Hudson Rivers; (3) by diverting a portion of the traffic from the crooked, narrow, and overcrowded reaches of the East River to west and south of Wards Island; and (4) by increasing the circulation of water in the Harlem River south of the entrance to the Kills, thus reducing the annual deposit of silt in that reach.

Further, Col. Black says with respect to the current velocities through Hell Gate, which, through certain stages of the tide, are so great as to endanger navigation seriously, that by careful investigation he has arrived at the conclusion that if the Harlem Kills were improved, the maximum mean velocities of a mean tide in Hell Gate would be reduced by 1.1 miles per hour, or 28 per cent, for north-bound currents and by a proportionate amount for south bound, and that these results would be attended by favorable influences on navigation and sanitation in the Harlem River.

I am astounded to find that there never has been an examination and report by the engineers upon the effect of the \$154,000,000 improvement of the State Barge Canal with reference to the commercial development of the lower Harlem and East Rivers since the State Barge Canal improvement act was adopted; and there has been no action by any Congress since that time tending to effect cooperation at this point with the State authorities. I do not criticize the members of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, but, to my mind, this fully illustrates the absolute necessity for the consideration of the conditions in the port of New York by special legislation and not as a part of the great and laborious work of the Rivers and Harbors Committee. The conditions at New York are such they can not be controlled by a rule adopted to govern conditions in rural localities.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I shall presently introduce a resolution to meet the needs of the situation at New York with a view to authorizing an appropriation sufficient to undertake and carry forward all pending and reported improvements of the harbor of New York in accordance with the commercial necessities not only of the present day but as the best judgment of this House can determine as to the future.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. RAUCH.

Mr. RAUCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. CARAWAY.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Speaker, representing the district I do, I shall support this measure. That district I have the honor to represent is composed of 11 counties, and a portion of every one of those counties is now under water. We have in the State of Arkansas at this time flood conditions extending up and down the Mississippi River for a distance of 72 miles, and in some places 60 miles in width and between 2,000 and 3,000 square miles of our territory is now under water from 2 to 7 feet in depth. The district I represent has 350 miles of Mississippi River front. Crossing it are five navigable streams. Every one of those streams subjects the country surrounding it to overflow. The subject of this resolution, therefore, vitally affects everybody residing in my district. For that reason I realize I shall be charged with self-motives if I urge its passage. I therefore shall say only that I intend to support it. The remainder of my time I shall devote to a discussion of the local conditions now prevailing in my State, and do this in support of a resolution I introduced yesterday asking for immediate relief.

For quite a while I lived on the banks of the Mississippi River. From the front door of my house to the levees that confined the waters of that mighty river to its channel was not greater than the distance across this Chamber. I have seen every man and woman, white and black, spend days and nights fighting floods. I have seen these waters when they were more than 20 feet above the level of the land kept within an embankment 2 feet of which were but sacks of sand. Anyone who has never gone through the experience of an overflow in the Mississippi Valley will never know what it is.

The conditions are peculiar there. I have heard it charged that we come here and ask relief when we are able to help ourselves. That statement is not true. While the State of Arkansas has been admitted to the Union for nearly 100 years—it was admitted in 1836—there was no substantial progress made in that section of the State bordering on the Mississippi River until within the last generation. It is common knowledge to all that the people who go into a country to be pioneers are usually poor. Rich people prefer to stay in that part of the country where the battles for civilization and ease have been fought and won. Within the last 15 years 75 per cent of some of the counties in my district were so subject to overflow that I have seen land of the finest quality covered with fine timber sell at \$1.25 an acre. We have paid there within that time for the purpose of building levees and digging ditches to carry off the surface water, in taxes voluntarily levied upon ourselves, a greater sum, twice over, than the original value of the land when we took possession of it. I have seen people without means other than the ownership of some fruitful soil that frequently overflowed, voluntarily vote upon themselves for drainage and flood protection a tax of \$10 an acre or more on their land. The people who own that property do not stop at that when it comes to protection of their country against floods. In Mississippi County, in my district, I know a gentleman who spent out of his private means in one year more than \$20,000 to fight floods in that county, never asked the Federal Government or anyone else to repay him a cent of this sum.

In my own town during times of distress caused by overflow I have seen practically every home thrown open to receive refugees from the flooded districts. I myself have received them until they slept four to a bed. We have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars for temporary relief for those driven from their homes by floods. This relief has been extended to all who were afflicted, regardless of race or color. It has been given freely, with the full knowledge that not one cent was ever to be returned, and there was no desire that it should be.

As I said a minute ago, ordinarily those people who are pioneers in any country, and it is doubly true in this flooded area, are people without means. They are full of energy and courage. They have gone into this section because it has great promise for the future. What they have earned in most instances they have devoted to the building of their homes and to the fight to protect them from the ravages of the rivers. They are therefore, or a great percentage of them are, poorly provided for against emergencies of this kind. The destruction of their crops and of their stock leaves them helpless, and in many instances absolute destitution and want face them. They must depend either upon private charity or upon the aid of their common country.

We have not been niggardly in providing for the relief of those who suffer disaster in other sections. I voted to extend relief to the people in Salem, Mass., when it was visited by a disastrous fire; I voted to relieve the situation of the people in Dayton, Ohio, when the floods swept away their homes; I have voted to appropriate money to relieve distress wherever it has been found; to preserve the public health and protect the public morals, and I think it therefore not unreasonable that in times like this we should look to the Federal Government for aid. We have extended it freely to all other sections and all other people. I feel certain it will not be denied to these. We are an independent people in my State. We have provided liberally for the relief of those who have been unfortunate. We have institutions where those whom nature has afflicted may be cared for in comfort, and their conditions made as pleasant as possible. We have taxed ourselves to redeem the country in which we live in far greater sums than our aggregate assessed wealth now is. We do not ask to be relieved against those burdens that are common to all sections of our country. We ask only that the Government shall in part relieve the distress of the people who have been visited by great national disasters such as this. I venture the assertion that if all the people who are now suffering and distressed from the flooded condition in my State dwelled together in one city, and such a disaster were to overtake them, it would create such public sentiment and excite such public sympathy that the Congress of the United States would rush to their relief within the hour. Then shall it be denied to these because they dwell in remote places and most of them are poor and unknown? By far the majority of these people who are at this time afflicted belong to the colored race. These have been looked upon as the wards of the Nation, but we do not now ask that the National Government shall expend one-tenth as great a sum to relieve their distress as the white people among whom they live will expend in their behalf.

We ask only that they be assisted to the extent that they may live and not suffer until this disaster shall have passed away.

I hope the Committee on Appropriations will immediately report out my resolution so that a vote may be had on it, and relief extended to those who now cry out for it.

Mr. GARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote in favor of the adoption of this resolution. As I understand the purpose of our honored Speaker in introducing this measure, it is intended to create a committee having jurisdiction over all bills relating to flood control whether the floods occur on navigable or non-navigable streams. Heretofore all such bills have been referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, but that committee insists that its jurisdiction is limited to the improvement of the navigation of streams in order that commerce might be promoted. It is true that in carrying out this policy levees have been ostensibly constructed to confine the rivers to their channels but which have actually prevented the inundation of riparian lands and contiguous sections. This work, however, was all done under the guise of improving the navigation of the rivers for the benefit of commerce.

I come from a State where we have dry rivers and no harbors, and I want to see a committee established that will give consideration to the flood problems on nonnavigable streams. I can best illustrate the nature of the relief that the people of Arizona are seeking by recounting the damage done by the recent floods on the Gila River. I shall begin by reading an article printed in the *Graham Guardian*, published at Safford, Ariz. At least 6,000 acres of rich alfalfa land in Graham County, every acre of it worth more than a hundred dollars, have been washed away by successive floods, and if something is not done to stop this devastation even greater areas will be turned from fruitful farms into wastes of sand and boulders.

#### GILA RIVER OVERFLOWS BANKS.

The continuous rains of the past week culminated Wednesday in the biggest snowstorm that the valley has seen in 39 years.

The snowstorm was not all the valley had as a result of the week's rain. The Gila River cleared both banks and for a time things looked serious. The waters swept over the farming lands bordering the river, carrying away land and everything in its path.

At Solomonville it almost reached the town. It spread over William Gillespie's ranch and destroyed a new crop of barley valued at \$1,500.

Nearer here it swept over part of Walter McIntyre's ranch and carried away 40 hogs.

North of Safford the river overflowed into the lower fields of the Prina and Layton ranches. On the Thorpe ranch, which is located on the south bank of the river, the waters ran several feet deep and through the lumber house where the ranch hands lived.

On the Clayton ranch, east of the Thorpe ranch, the water covered the entire ranch to a depth of several feet. About 12 hogs were reported lost at this place Wednesday night.

About 2 o'clock Wednesday afternoon Herman Foster, Denzil Thorpe, and Claude Bledsoe drove to the Thorpe ranch in a wagon and got all the bedding and clothing out of the house and then started to save the stock.

They got 6 cows and a calf to a place of safety and saved about 30 hogs, including young pigs, out of 65.

Hinton Mullenax and several others went to the rescue of Mrs. Blanche Edwards, who lives on the ranch adjoining Thorpe's, and saved all her household goods. Twelve hogs, all she owned, were last seen marooned on an island back of the ranch house.

The river overflowed its banks all the way down the valley. The roar of the waters could be heard for a considerable distance.

At Pima it was feared the bridge would go out, but the structure stood firm against the attacks of the maddened stream. The waters finally overflowed and broke through the protection of piling and rocks on the north side of the river and east of the bridge, which had been placed to turn the current. The water found a weak spot and washed out the road leading to the north approach of the bridge.

On the Pima side the road to the approach was not damaged by the river, but was overflowed by the waters from Cottonwood wash.

About 10 o'clock yesterday morning a stream about 100 feet wide was going over the road that led to the north approach, leaving only the wood part of the approach next to the bridge.

The following editorial sums up the situation:

#### SAVE THE RIVER LANDS.

There is so much of the farming land going into the Gila River since the recent high water that our farmers have woken up to the necessity of taking immediate steps to stop the depredations of the river.

Acres after acres has been engulfed in this vicious stream the last three weeks, and more going in daily. Some ranches have lost from 5 to 20 acres, and the total losses will aggregate nearly \$50,000.

It is time our valley farmers got busy on some proposition that will lead to united action in the saving of these valuable lands bordering on both sides of the river. Further delay in the matter may mean that it will be impossible to do anything in the way of straightening the Gila River.

Already the river has made great headway east of town and in direct line with the railroad tracks. Some day, unless something is done at this point of the river, the old Gila will come flowing down Twelfth Street and head straight for Thatcher.

It is no wonder that every time I visit the upper Gila Valley the stricken citizens say to me, "Why is it that Congress can do nothing for our relief?" I am always compelled to make the same old answer, which every Congressman has made for

the last hundred years, that no money is spent by the Federal Government except to promote commerce on navigable streams, and that, therefore, I can hold out no hope to them.

At Winkelman, farther down the stream, four persons were drowned in the flood waters of the Gila according to the following press dispatches:

WINKELMAN, ARIZ., January 20.

Last night the river broke in around the race track in the vicinity of the James Pruitt property. George McClaine, a teamster named Johnson, and two women—a woman known only as Ollie, and Ellen Smith—were drowned. A woman named Jean Elliott was saved.

Three men floated down the river on top of a house. The house struck some obstacle and the three men went under the water, but were rescued. Charles Osborne, Bert Vallentine, and P. H. Smith were those rescued.

WINKELMAN, January 22.

The flood is entirely over here, but the results still remain. The bridge across the Gila is entirely gone. The town is entirely cut off from the outside as far as the railroad service is concerned.

The Gila has dropped, and a search has been started for the bodies of those drowned several days ago. The body of Ollie Devore, one of the women drowned, was found about 9 miles down the river.

All those made homeless by the high water are being taken care of by local people. It is expected that many whose homes are still left will return in a day or so and start to clean things up.

Continuing down the stream the floods spread destruction in Pinal County, as is shown by the following account taken from the *Arizona Blade-Tribune*, of Florence, under date of January 22, 1916:

#### GILA OUT OF BANKS—THE BIGGEST FLOOD SINCE 1884—MUCH DAMAGE DONE.

For the second time almost within a year the Gila River bridge is impassable, made so by extremely high waters that this time caused a tremendous washout in the graded approach on the south side of the bridge, which occurred on Wednesday of this week, and all vehicle communication with the north side of the river is at a standstill, and will be until the waters recede so the river may be forded.

At dark Wednesday evening the gap between the south end of the bridge and the mainland was fully 250 feet wide. By 8 o'clock the next morning it was no less than 500 feet wide, and the water was fast eating its way farther into the mainland, until finally the entire graded approach to the bridge was eaten away and the main channel of the river had changed from its former course on the north side to the extreme south bank and is now entirely south of the south end of the bridge and is rapidly cutting away and ruining valuable farms along the river. Just how badly farms are being damaged can not be told until the water subsides.

More than half a mile of road leading to the approach to the bridge has been badly washed out, and it will cost several thousand dollars to replace it in its former condition, and little of this work can be done until the water has fallen to a low point.

The condition of some of the Mexicans living on the edge of the mesa was most pitiable. Their meager belongings were soaked with the muddy waters from the river and their houses flooded. This was caused by the water running over into the lowland just at the northern limit of the city and being backed up by the sewer levee, which finally broke, and the water flowed through onto the Kelner lands, completely inundating that property.

To save a break in the sewer line right at the north end of Main Street a dozen or more men were kept busy for several hours, and the levee was raised a foot and a half. However, farther out, the line went out in two places, taking away a hundred feet or more of the sewer.

The issue of this newspaper for the following week continues the account of the damage:

#### LOCAL DAMAGE BY STORM.

While no loss of life was suffered in this county as a result of the big flood of last week, a great deal of damage to lands lying along the Gila River is reported. The greatest damage done in this immediate vicinity was the washing away of a large portion of the ranch of Juan Aguilar, which lies along the south bank of the river just east of the roadway leading to the bridge. Out of between 70 and 80 acres, Mr. Aguilar now has not more than 15 or 20 acres left, and a great deal of fencing on the remaining acres was washed away. Mr. Aguilar places his loss at \$3,000.

L. K. Drails also lost nearly half of his 23-acre ranch west of the Aguilar lands across the road.

The Kelner ranch, still farther down the river half a mile, lost fully 60 acres of land, which were washed away by the raging torrent of flood waters. This ranch suffered the loss of about 20 acres during the big flood of a year ago. At this point the land was not overflowed, but being a sand loam was easily washed out by the flood.

Adjoining the Kelner ranch was the 40-acre ranch of Mrs. Mattie L. Dart, and not more than 5 acres of this place remains. Mrs. Dart had just completed installing a pumping plant on her place, and was due to prove up on her desert entry yesterday. A house and barn on this place were saved from the flood by being hauled to higher ground before the water reached them. The land where these buildings stood has been washed away.

Across the river considerable damage was done to the Nicholas irrigation ditch and to lands on that side of the river. J. R. Treat is probably the heaviest loser, some 20 acres of his land having been washed away. It is also reported that Mrs. Watson's 160-acre ranch was considerably damaged, but no one has been over the property and it is not known just how badly this property was washed.

Emile Pierson, who lives  $7\frac{1}{2}$  miles of Florence on the opposite side of the river, was in Florence Monday, and stated that his property had not been damaged by the flood, but stated that G. W. Pattee, who recently purchased the George and Adrain Pierson ranches, had lost between 10 and 15 acres.

The J. J. Fraser ranch of 800 acres, just west of Florence on this side of the river, which is now being farmed by T. E. Moody, was damaged by loss of half a mile of ditch and the washing away of possibly 4 acres of land.

The Clemans ranch at Adamsville lost something like 10 acres of land and half a mile of ditch and some fencing.



On down the river 8 miles C. M. Shannon lost nearly a mile and a half of ditch. No damage was done to his pumping plant nor to his 600-acre ranch.

The matter of repairing the break in the south approach to the Gila River bridge has not yet been definitely determined upon. Engineer G. F. Twitchell was here Wednesday but made no statement in regard to the matter.

It is conceded that it would be a waste of time and money to rebuild the approach on its former lines and that nothing short of several hundred feet of concrete work should be considered. The gap washed in the approach is fully 1,000 feet wide and to rebuild it with earth and gravel would be folly as the next big flood would be most likely to wipe it out again.

The Gila River Indian Reservation lies just below Florence, and our Indian wards have suffered great losses that they can ill afford to bear, as is shown by the following telegram that I have just received from the superintendent of the Pima Agency at Sacaton:

SACATON VIA CASA GRANDE, ARIZ., February 3, 1916.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Recent flood damage to Indian lands and canals is more than \$100,000 on Pima Reservation. Immediate relief urgent.

THACKERY, Superintendent.

That part of the valley of the Gila in Maricopa County, Ariz., known as the Buckeye Valley also suffered severe damage from the recent floods. The Buckeye Valley News of January 20, 1916, contains the following account of the flood conditions:

**BIGGEST FLOOD IN MANY YEARS—RAILROADS, CANAL SYSTEMS, AND PUBLIC HIGHWAYS SUFFER BIG LOSSES.**

The Buckeye Valley has been subjected to the biggest flood the past week ever known; that is, a greater volume of water has passed down the Gila River. Old-timers admit this. Several years ago the Gila was on a rampage and reached a point farther up on the highlands, but that was before the channel of the river was as pronounced as at the present time.

The water is higher, much higher than last year and damage greater. The individual loss in this valley is not very great, but the stockholders of both canals, Buckeye and Arlington, will sustain a loss greater than in 1915. The Flower Pot's Enterprise headgates, we understand, escaped damage. The water is so high at the present writing that it is impossible to ascertain just what fate the Buckeye Dam has met, but is presumed that it is entirely swept away. The canal is uninjured. The Arlington Canal suffered quite a severe loss, and the current of the river is sweeping down through their canal for quite a distance. The dam is supposed to be intact, but a new current has been formed on the north of their headgate and has probably caused considerable damage. The Hassayampa River was also higher than for several years and this flood water undermined the flume of the Arlington Canal Co. and either destroyed or badly damaged it. The water in the Hassayampa has subsided and the river is fordable.

The Arizona Eastern Railroad, as usual, came in for their share of loss from the storm. From reliable information we learn that their loss will be greater than last year. The bridge is still standing in spite of the thousand and one reports to the contrary. The approaches on both sides are washed out in numerous places, on the west side as far up as where the wagon road crosses the railroad. We have had no mail since Monday, and it is impossible to make an intelligent guess as to when mail service will be resumed. For two days the telephone line between here and Phoenix has been out, but is now in working order.

The same newspaper gives this story of a second flood:

#### THE AFTERMATH.

Scarcely had the News been delivered at the post office last week when word was received that another flood was coming down the Agua Frio, Salt, and Gila Rivers. By noon Friday the gauge at the mouth of the Agua Frio above the Buckeye Dam indicated that the water was within 2 inches of the mark made by the high flood of two weeks ago. The Salt did not quite reach the high mark made by the former flood, but the Gila at this point was about the same as two weeks ago, and the damage is fully as great. There is considerable snow in the mountains and the indications are that the Gila will be a troublesome stream for weeks to come.

The Valley received no mail from Thursday of last week until Monday of this week. The long-distance telephone line was also out of commission during this time, and Buckeye was shut out from the world, and apparently by the world forgot. The telephone line is now in working order, and we are getting mail semioccasionally.

The Arizona Eastern Railroad sustained further damage on their Buckeye branch by losing more of their fill leading up to the Agua Frio bridge, but the bridge still stands.

The Buckeye Canal system is in about the same condition as the former flood left it in, except that the water from the slough north of the headgate broke into the upper end of the canal and filled it with silt and sand, but the canal is uninjured, and it will be a small matter to clean this portion of the canal.

Ranchers along the Gila River suffered fully as great a loss as they sustained 10 days ago, and some greater. Mrs. McDonald's ranch, between here and Liberty, has been toppling into the river for the past four or five days; also the Slagel ranch. Monday evening the river had eaten its way to within 120 feet of the McDonald residence, and it was necessary to move the house and other buildings up to the north line of the ranch Tuesday morning. The Slagel house, tank, and other buildings were also moved.

The Arlington Canal Co. also sustained additional heavy loss. From reliable information we learn that the headgate is badly damaged, and the upper end of the canal for quite a distance is completely washed away, and it is doubtful in the minds of many whether it will be possible to reconstruct that portion of the canal that is washed away. However, when the water recedes it may be found that the damage is not as great as is now feared.

The ranch of Thomas H. Bell, just south of the C. B. Parker place, is again almost entirely submerged and the house and outbuilding have toppled over; how badly the land is washed we are unable to state, but it is certainly in a deplorable condition now.

George Schmidt, on the old Hailger ranch, met with an additional loss of land to the amount of 5 acres, making a total of 7 acres of good rich soil that has toppled into the Gila and is forever gone.

The danger to none of these properties is past. The Gila will be high for several weeks to come, falling in the daytime and rising at night. It is not the excessively high water that does the damage; the receding water appears to undermine the bank and it falls into the river, the next high water washes this soil away, and as the water recedes again it undermines the bank and another large chunk of hundred-dollar land falls into the river.

These newspaper accounts mention but a part of the damage done by floods along the entire course of the Gila, and I would have you remember that I have confined my remarks to this one stream. As a matter of fact, great losses annually occur on every river in Arizona.

Neither shall I go into the details of the flood at the mouth of the Gila at Yuma, where the water ran 4 feet deep through the principal streets of that city, and where nearly a thousand people were left homeless. The destruction at Yuma does not come within the scope of my remarks, because the Colorado has been declared to be a navigable stream. It was a levee built by an appropriation in the river and harbor act of 1892 that broke, flooding the city. I hope to obtain an appropriation to repair this levee on the same theory which justified its original construction; that is, for the purpose of confining the Colorado to its channel in order to make it more navigable. Such an appropriation for the levee at Yuma can be recommended by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and I am hopeful that they will do so at an early date, even though it is admitted that the interests of navigation are slight.

No one doubts that Congress has power to make appropriations to promote commerce on navigable streams, for we have been spending Federal funds for this purpose for over a century, but whenever we ask for an appropriation to control the floods on nonnavigable streams the constitutionality of such a law is immediately questioned. There is no greater authority on the Constitution than Story, and this is the rule that he lays down:

The only limitations upon the power (to appropriate money in aid of internal improvements) are those prescribed by the terms of the Constitution, that the objects shall be for the common defense or the general welfare of the Union.

The true test is whether the object be of a local character and local use or whether it be of general benefit to the States. If it be purely local, Congress can not constitutionally appropriate money for the object. But if the benefit be general, it matters not whether in point of locality it be in one State or several, whether it be of large or of small extent, its nature and character determine the right, and Congress may appropriate money in aid of it, for it is then, in a just sense, for the general welfare.

In one sense the control of floods on a nonnavigable stream would confer nothing but a local benefit, and, therefore, Congress would have no right to authorize the expenditure of Federal funds for this purpose. But I maintain that no part of our common country can suffer an injury without affecting, in some degree, the general welfare, and, therefore, in whatever measure the general welfare may be promoted Congress can lawfully appropriate money to that extent.

For example, take the money that has been spent in the reclamation of arid land. Congress has said that since the benefits conferred are to a large extent local in their character the Government can not properly make the irrigation works a free gift to the settlers whose lands are thus made valuable. It does, however, promote the general welfare of the whole country to have the deserts and waste places changed into cultivated fields, and, therefore, the Federal Government can, under the Constitution, loan the money necessary to construct canals and reservoirs without interest.

And so it appeals to me that there could be no doubt about the constitutionality of an act which provided that the Federal Government might loan money to landowners along a nonnavigable stream for the purpose of controlling the floods that are now destroying their farms. Certainly those who receive the major portion of the benefit should pay the larger share of the cost, but to the extent that all of our people are benefited the Government of the United States should also pay its share.

Aside from promoting the general welfare, the Federal Government has a further interest in the control of floods on nonnavigable streams. A flood rarely occurs that it does not interrupt traffic on the railroads, thus interfering with interstate commerce. Every argument that can be made for appropriations in behalf of commerce on navigable streams applies with equal, if not greater, force to the safeguarding of commerce by rail.

At one time commerce, both interstate and international, was chiefly by water, but in recent years our commerce has come to be carried on mainly by railroads. Under the Constitution Congress now exercises the same jurisdiction over these artificial highways that it has always had over waterways, although there was not a railway in existence at the time the Constitution was adopted. It certainly follows that Congress has power to appropriate money, to some extent, for the control of floods that interfere with interstate commerce by rail, and it matters not

whether the flood occurs on a navigable or a nonnavigable stream.

There is still another reason why our Government has an interest in flood control everywhere. Congress has power to establish post offices and post roads, yet there is not a destructive flood on any stream that does not interfere with the delivery of the mails. The United States, therefore, has a right to contribute something for the control of floods if the Postal Service is promoted and protected by doing so. This same reasoning would also justify such appropriations as means of national defense, because troops can not be readily moved or supplied when the rivers are in flood.

In order to arrive at a practical working basis for determining what interest the Federal Government has in the control of floods on any stream, and thus measuring the appropriations that can be legitimately made, it seems to me that this new committee must adopt a rule, similar to the rule now in force respecting appropriations by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, that no new project shall be undertaken until after an investigation has first been made by a board of engineers. The Government engineers should be required to make findings in their report which shall include the following subjects:

First. A plan for the control of floods on the stream and the estimated cost thereof.

Second. The proportionate interest that the United States has in the project, taking into consideration the general welfare, interference with interstate commerce, the delivery of the mails, and so forth.

Third. The proportionate share of the cost of the flood-protection works that should be paid by the riparian owners whose lands would be benefited.

With this data, prepared by competent engineers, available for consideration, the committee and the Congress could act intelligently in making appropriations for flood control.

I realize that there is no greater economic question before this Congress than the adoption of a proper policy for flood control, a question that affects not only the material welfare but the very lives of our citizens. It is the bounden and solemn duty of this Government to promote the safety, happiness, and prosperity of our people by every act of legislation, within constitutional limits, which Congress may deem conducive to these ends. I know only too well that the machinery of this great Government moves with exasperating slowness, but I believe that the establishment of this committee will hasten the day when real and substantial relief can be given to those who now suffer from the devastation wrought by floods. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the pending resolution to create a flood control committee bears the indorsement of our great Speaker of the House, which shows to me that it has had his thoughtful consideration. The Committee on Rules has also given it serious thought and reported it favorably to the House. I shall give it my support, although the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, of which I am a member, Mr. SPAKMAN, of Florida, may enter some objections to it. I always dislike to vote in opposition to this distinguished southerner. I shall do so in this case if he takes the view of the resolution he has indicated.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. I am sorry, but my time is short, I can not yield. Now, gentlemen of the House, and if there be members of the Appropriation Committee present—I see some present—I should like to have the benefit of their attention. I will say that down in the southeastern part of the State of Arkansas, mostly in my district, all along the Mississippi River, flood conditions there are reported to me as being horrible. My home city of Pine Bluff is located on the Arkansas River about 100 miles from the Mississippi, and nearly all the country from Pine Bluff to the Mississippi is under water, so to speak. Hundreds and hundreds of people are in destitute and in a terrible flood condition to-day. That is true not only in my district but out of my district. In the district represented by my colleague, Mr. CARAWAY, and in the district represented by my colleague, Mr. GOODWIN, similar conditions prevail. On the 27th day of January I received the first information concerning the flood and destitution through a telegram from the governor of my State. This great water that is in the Mississippi is unusual. The Arkansas River is on a rise now unprecedented in the history of that river. In front of my home city it is nearly 3 feet higher than ever known before. I have telegrams here that the flood water is backing up now into this city with alarming rapidity, which portends, I fear, terrible results.

So soon as I got information from the governor of the distressed situation I immediately visited the War Department for assistance, and was informed that no relief could be granted by the department; that the Congress of the United States in February—I believe it was—1913, passed a law prohibiting the department from sending food, tents, or clothing to sufferers of any character or from any cause. Because of my alarm and fear and seeing that prompt action should be taken and that a great emergency existed, I went to the American Red Cross Association of this city and called for relief. I was promised that they would send an agent down to the stricken district to investigate conditions. I have gotten nothing from any source up to date. It is said in the Good Book that "charity is the paramount virtue; all else is but as a sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal." And now, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, in this hour of great and dire distress of our people and while the citizens of my district and below and above me are appealing to you and the Senate, who constitute the Nation's Congress, for aid—for clothing, for tents, for shelter, and for rescue boats—I hope that you will not deny them. Since I have been a Member of this Congress I have always voted for the distressed and suffering people of this Nation everywhere when called upon for relief. I remember casting my vote to help the distressed fire-stricken people in the State of Massachusetts, at Salem. The same I did last year or the year before in the great flood disaster in the Ohio River Valley. I desire to read a few telegrams that I have received. Here is one from the governor of my State:

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., January 27, 1916.

Hon. SAM M. TAYLOR,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Mr. Stone, of Watson, Desha County, just phoned me to request immediate aid from Federal Government for 500 families in that vicinity who are in destitute circumstances on account of flood conditions on Arkansas River. If anything can be done, send in haste to Burnett Landing, on Arkansas River.

GEO. W. HAYS, Governor.

Here is another from people who are marooned:

WATSON, ARK., January 29, 1916.

Hon. SAMUEL M. TAYLOR,  
Congress Hall Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

We are surrounded by water all the way from 3 to 20 feet deep. About 500 families are homeless. We need immediate assistance. About 1,000 head of live stock need feed. We are cut off from train service. We have lost a lot of stock and feed. Get us assistance as soon as possible. The only way to reach us is by boat to Redfork, Burnett's Landing.

M. WOLCHANSEY,  
R. A. EMERSON,  
CHAS. MORGAN,  
B. T. OUTLAW,  
H. STROUD,  
H. ALCORN,  
T. J. HAEFORD,  
DR. HYDRICK,

Committee.

One boat was found in the Arkansas River. That was sent down to take suffering people out of the flood. The other boats is a Government dredge boat and is disabled and can not travel, it is said. I want to impress this fact upon you. It is about a hundred miles from the city where I live to the Mississippi River. The Arkansas River to the Mississippi is leveed by the money of the people who own land within the levee districts, and they voted to tax themselves to build these levees, as explained by Mr. CARAWAY. Those levees have broken. Here is a telegram from McGehee, from S. P. Dixon:

McGHEE, ARK., February 1, 1916.

Hon. SAM TAYLOR, Member Congress,  
Washington:

Levees broke at Cummins, Goree, and Douglas last night. Water covering entire territory between Grady south to Watson from Iron Mountain Railway tracks to Arkansas River. Dr. C. W. Dixon and Wallace Douglas, at Douglas, advise that immediate help is necessary. Hundreds of negroes are homeless and destitute. We want boats with 2,000 rations to come to Douglas at once. All communication cut off except telephone at Douglas. This is expected to go out at any time. Have appealed to governor.

S. P. DIXON.

I have another telegram here which I received last night from my son Dan, and you know I think that he would not exaggerate conditions. He says:

PINE BLUFF, ARK., February 2, 1916.

Hon. S. M. TAYLOR, Member Congress,  
362 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Levee in front of State farm broken for several miles and whole surrounding country inundated. Towns of Gould, Pendleton, and Douglas all under water; immediate vicinity of Varner and Dumas flooded. A large number of convicts at Cummins marooned. Conditions appalling and weather intensely cold. Government boats in this river are needed for relief; their use has been denied by engineer in charge at Little Rock, saying it is dangerous for them to pass Robroy bridge. Conditions existing justify the risk. Do your best to obtain boats and all other relief the Government can afford. East end of town, from about Alabama Street to first ward school and Cotton Belt shops, under water.

DAN.



Imagine, gentlemen, the situation—people in trees, on the tops of floating houses, to escape the flood, in cold weather such as we had here in Washington last night.

Here is a letter which I have just received, written by a lawyer of prominence, residing on the Mississippi River at the county seat, Arkansas City:

ARKANSAS CITY, ARK., January 31, 1916.

Hon. S. M. TAYLOR, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Well, we are in for the deepest flood ever known. Practically all of Desha County will be under from 1 to 7 feet deep. Chicot County will get the same, and the Tensas Basin in Louisiana will be very nearly all submerged. Would not be at all surprised if we have to beg for rations.

Your friend,

F. M. ROGERS.

Mr. Speaker, this is a true story of great trouble and suffering. A friend said to me the other day, "Why can not local contributions take care of the situation?" "Local contributions?" I replied; "why, our people are doing everything they can, but it takes thousands of dollars to undertake to take care of a situation so great and terrible as the one that I have described." The locality is great and all affected. Those citizens in times of normal conditions, when the water does not come from the breaking of the levees, can and do take care of every situation that comes up; but when you find them helpless, as now, away out, 20 or 30 miles, in the middle of a flooded country that is like an ocean, you can imagine how hard and costly it is to take care of the sufferers.

I have other telegrams here, which I ask consent to insert. I have messages stating lives have been lost.

The telegrams referred to are as follows:

S. M. TAYLOR, Washington:

Send me at Arkansas City 100 Government tents; 500 families in destitute condition; need supplies at once, whole country under water here. Answer.

C. C. HEMINGWAY, Mayor.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., January 28, 1916.

Hon. SAM M. TAYLOR,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Flood sufferers at Watson and vicinity are in destitute circumstances for food and shelter, many families have had to leave their homes. Should you need more definite information wire Elbert Stone, Watson, Ark.

GEO. W. HAYS, Governor.

PINE BLUFF, ARK., February 1, 1916.

Congressman SAM M. TAYLOR,

Congress Hall, Washington, D. C.:

Between 1,000 and 1,500 people in Douglas section destitute, need supplies, result of flood. Others in this section similarly situated; need urgent. Can you get Government aid? We are starting subscription here to-night and will do what we can. Wire reply.

THE GRAPHIC.

PINE BLUFF, ARK., February 1, 1916.

Congressman S. M. TAYLOR,

Washington, D. C.:

Residents of Douglas and that vicinity in a perilous situation owing to breaks in levees in Auburn and Linwood districts. Our two packet boats unable to meet all demands. Snagboat Arkansas tied up here, but Engineer Dent at Little Rock states she is unsafe to make the trip to Douglas. Old river men claim she can go to Douglas without even getting into the current or channel or in any dangerous position. Twenty-five families marooned at Douglas. Would like Arkansas for use as houseboat if nothing better. Can you render any assistance. Lateness of this dispatch caused by promise of Maj. Dent to send boat, which this afternoon was countermanded for reasons above stated.

E. B. BLOOM,  
Secretary Chamber of Commerce.

DOUGLAS, ARK., February 1, 1916.

S. M. TAYLOR, Washington, D. C.:

Levees broken in three places on both ends of State farm and at Douglas. Send provisions for 300 families and hay for stock. Thousands of acres flooded.

C. W. DIXON.  
W. W. DOUGLAS.  
R. E. LAKE.

WATSON, ARK., February 1, 1916.

Hon. S. M. TAYLOR, Washington, D. C.:

We the undersigned ask of you to get feed and rations on account of floods for 1,500 people and 1,000 head of stock.

A. S. TOUNE.  
J. E. HARRIS.  
DR. E. C. HYDRICK.  
R. A. EMERSON.  
M. W. OLCHANSKY.  
S. L. BOYD.  
BEN OUTLAW.  
CHAS. MORGAN.

ARKANSAS CITY, ARK., February 2, 1916.

Hon. SAM M. TAYLOR,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

We urge you to earnestly support emergency appropriation bill in Congress to make high-water fight.

DR. VERNON McCAMMON.  
JOE DEMARKE.  
GEORGE R. LACY.

McGHEE, ARK., February 3, 1916.

Hon. S. M. TAYLOR,

Congressman, Washington, D. C.:

Appreciate your efforts on big appropriation. What is needed now is immediate relief along Arkansas River. Situation desperate at Douglas and Red Fork, and Pendleton Levee broke at Pendleton yesterday, drowning hundreds of cattle which had been driven there from Watson and other low territory. Doubtless some lives lost. Freezing weather. Suggest you obtain Mississippi River steamboat, provision same, and send up Arkansas River with 2,000 rations for Red Fork, Pendleton, South Bend, and Douglas. Upper territory can be handled from Pine Bluff.

S. P. DIXON.

ARKANSAS CITY, ARK., February 3, 1916.

Hon. SAM M. TAYLOR,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Our town inundated. All parties who are able have left the town. There is still several hundred people remaining who were unable to leave. We will be in need of assistance. Make every effort to help us.

C. T. SMITH, M. D.

Telegraph and railway facilities to flooded districts cut off—have just received the following message:

SAM TAYLOR:

Your messages of this morning to C. W. Dixon, Douglas, Ark., also one to Rice, Varner, Ark., are being held at Little Rock, Ark., account of the floods. No wires or mail trains.

W. U. TEL. CO.

Before concluding my remarks I wish to appeal to the Appropriations Committee of the House to report immediately out the joint resolution favorably which I introduced calling for \$250,000 to be paid out for the relief and benefit of the suffering people in eastern Arkansas, in the district I have the honor to represent, as also for the relief of those sufferers above and below my district. There need be no fear that this money will be expended unnecessarily, because the resolution provides that it shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War. He will take care that no money is extravagantly used, but that it shall go directly to those who are in want and in great distress; and if it should turn out that all of this appropriation should not be needed, then what is not properly expended will be covered back into the Treasury of the United States. And if our Appropriations Committee will report the resolution favorably to this House, I feel that I know that the great throbbing hearts of its membership and their disposition to do a great charity to worthy citizens and to poor suffering men, women, and children, that the resolution will be promptly passed.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the great city of Philadelphia has never been wanting in extending the hand of relief and assistance when needed elsewhere throughout the country. She has taken high rank as a city readily equipped and able to assist those who happen to suffer calamity, but the situation before us now is one that involves other questions than that of relieving distress such as now prevails along the Mississippi Valley and these Arkansas rivers, for which the gentlemen from that State have so well spoken. There is distress there, and all of us, I am sure, would be glad to relieve that distress; but suddenly, and without notice, a very important resolution is presented to the House which proposes to create a committee, not to meet an emergency that now exists but to establish a permanent new force in this House, which may not only work for temporary relief in such an emergency as this, but which will seek, in the course of time, the expenditure of vast sums of money for permanent uses.

I have no particular quarrel with the proposition to spend money for emergency relief or for permanent relief where it may be necessary, but I call the attention of the House to the fact that if we are to spend money we must also raise money. We do not raise money, when we extend relief through some newly-created committee, on the ground that those in distress live along streams that happen to be interstate or even wholly within a State. It is by improving streams for commerce and navigation that we raise revenues of the Government, and such navigable streams should be improved if we are to obtain money to relieve such distress as is here depicted.

But overnight, Mr. Chairman, a resolution comes in here which apparently takes away from the great Committee on Rivers and Harbors its duty, to a limited degree at least, of looking after the navigation and commerce interests of the country. Heretofore the work such as is now contemplated, if I understand the purpose of the new rule, has been done with appropriations made through the Committee on Rivers and Harbors working under a systematic plan, having the approval of the engineers of the United States Government. Due to this emergency, however, and because the time is ripe—although it may not be the ripest time to talk of increased expenditures

through new committees raised for special purposes—it is thus suddenly proposed to limit the work of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and give to a new committee comparatively the limited powers in recommending expenditures.

In 1879, I think it was, Congress created the Mississippi River Commission, which was to take entire charge of the work of the Mississippi River and its tributaries. That commission was not to last long, but it has lasted from that time to this, and each year increasing appropriations have been made to it through the Committee on Rivers and Harbors for the work along the Mississippi Valley. It has not been work wholly in the line of commerce and navigation. Most waterways men will concede that the Rivers and Harbors Committee has been up against the problem of making appropriations for the Mississippi and other flood rivers through the medium and excuse of commerce and navigation, much to the disadvantage of legitimate commercial waterways.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I have some of the time of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Now, it may be that the work of flood prevention, the construction of levees along the Mississippi to control the current of the river, or of any other levees on any other river, may not properly be the work of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I will not dispute that now. I believe that on one occasion I undertook by an amendment to separate the work and to take this great business of the conservation of our resources and flood control away from a purely commerce and navigation committee. But the amendment did not succeed. I am not sure that I object to the separation now, but I think there should have been some discussion of the subject, not incident to a flood emergency, but in the usual deliberative manner. I would have no objection to considering this rule if it had not come in overnight in the nature of a surprise. There is a big question here. We are confronted, for one thing, with the problem of diverting commerce and navigation money for the purposes of flood prevention. We ought not to detract from commerce and navigation.

Charges of "pork barrel" are being made in the great newspapers of the country against perfectly legitimate commerce and navigation projects. They have already suffered considerably. It has not been the fault of these legitimate projects. The attacks have been based largely upon the fact that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has been obliged at times to go beyond its ordinary commerce and navigation jurisdiction and appropriate for the construction of levees which primarily were for the prevention of floods.

Of course we all want to prevent floods; we want to prevent them along the shores of New Jersey, where the sea waves sometimes sweep property into the ocean and where men and women lose their lives, just as we want protection down in the Mississippi Valley, where floods come periodically. We want to stop floods that rush over a dam at Johnstown and carrying 4,000 lives into eternity at one fell swoop, just as we want to prevent floods that course down the streams of the Middle West, even from the Northern States, until they inundate the plantations of the South. That we want to do in a general and fair way, and I do not object to the Government contributing; but I do not want for a moment to permit this resolution to go through without a protest, if it be necessary, against the plan, if there be such a plan, of reducing the earning power of the Government through legitimate commerce and navigation and turning rivers and harbors funds over to flood prevention.

The States of the South have contributed to the building of levees along their streams, and we can not charge it up to them that in the matter of self-preservation in the protection of their own property they have not done their best. But every river and harbor bill that has come in within my recollection has included appropriations, earned in part from commerce and navigation, that have gone grudgingly for the purposes of navigation and liberally for the building up of river banks to protect private property against the ravages of flood. While we are considering this resolution, therefore, we should also remember that some important legitimate projects have been unduly postponed in recent river and harbor bills, and that the revenue-earning power of the Government has suffered in consequence. I would relieve distress, but I would not check legitimate river and harbor work in doing it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. GARRETT. Does the gentleman from Florida care to consume more time at this point?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I understand the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] desires to use some time now.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD].

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker and gentleman of the House, as a member of the Rules Committee I was constrained to give this resolution my most hearty support, and I rise at this time for the purpose of speaking in favor of it.

It is my steadfast belief, based upon a good many years of intimate study and acquaintance and association and professional connection with this problem, that there is no project that can be devised by this Congress, save the one of preparation for the national defense, that is a more legitimate object for Federal aid and Federal support than the subject of flood control and flood prevention. [Applause.]

I can see, perhaps more clearly than some of those who have been Members of this House for a longer time, the questions that are about to arise because of a conflict of jurisdiction of committees, but the fact remains, gentlemen, that practically since the Government has been founded and established this question of flood control has been presenting itself at periodical times, year by year, and it is still as near unsolved as it was at the day when the first President of the United States raised his hand to be inaugurated.

It has not been settled, and it has been made a game of battle-dore and shuttlecock between the committees of this House, one saying that it did not have jurisdiction and jurisdiction being denied to another.

In my humble judgment and opinion, for which I claim no particular merit, it is time that there should be a committee that should have control of this question and at once commence to make the plans for the relief that is so much needed.

Gentlemen, while we talk here to-day, and as we have failed to act in years gone by, the lives of men and women and children have gone out, destroyed by the great floods of our rivers, and millions of dollars worth of property has been destroyed every year.

If any farmer or any ordinary business man in all the United States would handle a problem as the problem of flood control has been handled in the United States, it would be denounced by all who knew of it as being absolutely idiotic.

Now, let no gentlemen misapprehend what I have said. It shall be my course while I am in this House to endeavor to fully and properly observe the courtesies of debate and to refrain at all times from any harsh words.

But I do speak of the policy.

It is idiotic.

There is only one way the question of flood control can be handled, and that is by recognizing the fact that each year, or very often if not each year, a flood is coming down the channels of the great rivers and the lesser streams of the United States, that its quantity can be measured and estimated, and there must be left in the channel of that river a sufficient carrying capacity, within which man does not invade, to make safe the carrying away of these waters and insure their rapid exit either to the sea or the larger rivers.

This work can not be done in a day. The expense would be prohibitive. It can not be commenced perhaps at this time because of the more pressing needs for the appropriations and moneys of the country, but the demand for relief from floods goes up, and it does exist, and will not be satisfied until it is answered by relief being afforded the people from flood loss in practically every State in this Union.

It is in no sense of the word a local question. Take, for instance, the Mississippi River. It is fed from the streams up in Wisconsin, over in Indiana, in Illinois, in Missouri, Minnesota, the Dakotas, and other States, and then by the Ohio River with all its branches, until the streams from some 31 States go to make up the stream that flows so majestically and mightily to the Gulf.

In time of flood in the Mississippi River 2,000,000 cubic feet of water per second is flowing through the middle portion of the South; 120,000,000 cubic feet a minute, making a total of nearly 1,000,000,000 gallons of water every minute flowing in this stream, that spreads out through the country without let or hindrance, when there is a crevasse or when the levees break, carrying devastation and destruction with it.

It is a problem that must be met with a broad national spirit. It is one that must be met now, so far as plans are concerned. It is one that is crying out for solution, and it is one that will no longer tolerate delay while committees claim and disclaim jurisdiction.



There is not a President of the United States but has declared himself to be in favor of this policy for the last 15 or 20 years. When the great parties have met in convention each and every one of them went upon record as being in favor of the conservation of the life and the conservation of the property and the restraining of the waters of these streams, and to do less now would be to refuse to commence to discharge a duty that is apparent and insistent and plain.

Now, though we can not at this time, perhaps, proceed to do the actual work, a committee of Congress can take steps that will be the commencement of the relief that is demanded.

Mr. SMALL. Will the gentleman yield for an interruption?

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Yes.

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman is on the Committee on Rules and unquestionably has studied this resolution. One of the main criticisms I have is as to the language "subjects relating to flood control," which go to this committee. Now, presumably legislation will be sought to prevent damage from flood. Does the gentleman understand that that includes damage to contiguous lands and, for their preservation, a reclamation of lands? Does it also include the building of levees for the purpose of preserving contiguous lands? Does it include, for instance, the construction of revetments along the river banks? Will the gentleman kindly say which one of those it includes?

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. To enter into any discussion at the present time of the engineering problems that are involved, with the minute or two remaining to me, would be absolutely impossible.

The jurisdiction that is voted to this committee and will be conferred upon it, if it is established by this resolution, is for the purpose of controlling floods.

I apprehend that if the committee acts it will act in a broad spirit. I apprehend that when this provision of the resolution attempting to "control floods" will be construed, it will be construed as provisions of the Constitution are construed—broadly, and in such a way as will accomplish the purpose for which it was sought to be enacted—and, of course, the purpose for which it is sought to be enacted, upon its face and as a matter of current history, is not to relieve a temporary emergency of flooding, but to produce a condition that will relieve the recurrent floods from year to year, and thus "control floods."

Mr. SMALL. Will the gentleman permit another interruption?

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMALL. Floods do damage to channels of rivers. Will this committee have jurisdiction of damages to channels from flood waters?

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I would take it, with sincere respect to the gentleman, that my friend is either opposed to the resolution or is an extremely strict constructionist, for the construction which he places upon it would be strained and unnatural and, it occurs to me, entirely unreasonable. The damage to channels from flood waters might possibly be considered, but it would not be the main power of the committee but only an incidental one.

No. The construction that should be placed upon this, unless common sense has departed from us, is in the face of emergency, when life is being lost and property is being destroyed and welfare is being threatened, to take those steps, or to commence to take those steps, that will afford an ultimate control of floods and their prevention.

It is idle to say that it can not be done. The solution of this problem affects nearly every State. It concerns us all. It concerns the good people of Illinois who have honored me with a membership in this House. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Merely for the purpose of making further reply to the questions asked me, Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SPARKMAN addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GILFIELD].

Mr. OLDFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that I am in favor of this resolution, but I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this resolution. I am not in favor of it because of any emergency that exists, but I am in favor of it as a permanent committee of this House. There is an urgent necessity for just such a committee. I live on the Mississippi River, and this committee is of first importance to all those who live along its banks. If the jurisdiction of the committee was confined alone to the leveeing of the Mississippi River for the prevention of floods, the committee would have ample to do.

The Mississippi River drains the waters of 31 States and a small portion of Canada. Probably about one-half of the entire territory of the continental United States is drained by this river and its branches. All of this immense volume of water coming from this enormous territory goes through what is known as the lower Mississippi. In recent years, probably due very largely to the cutting out of the timber in this territory, floods have become frequent and have from time to time caused great loss of life and property and great distress. Before levees were built in the seasons of floods the Mississippi from St. Louis down just spreads over the whole valley. This valley is one of the richest territories in the world; indeed, no other valley can be compared with it. Before levees were built, because of the annual overflow, the lands were of little value; but not long after the Civil War a system of levees were begun, confining the waters of the Mississippi and protecting the lands along its low-water shores. It has taken a long time to build these levees, and they are not yet complete. The Government spends annually several million dollars in building and maintaining them, and the several States through which they pass contribute many millions more for a like purpose. Under this dual system much has been accomplished; yet, as lands are cleared up above, the floods become much larger, and from time to time these levees in weak spots give way, often causing loss of life and great loss of property.

Appropriations for the building and maintenance of these levees are provided for by the Rivers and Harbors Committee and are included in the annual rivers and harbors bill. Ordinarily a lump sum is appropriated and turned over to the Mississippi River Commission for allotment, and that commission allots as it sees proper and in connection with allotments coming from the various levee districts up and down the river.

It is easy to see, therefore, that this method of dealing with a great national question, like the question of the control of the flood waters of the Mississippi River, is, to say the least of it, a very haphazard one. There ought to be a general, uniform plan to control the flood waters of this great river and for the protection of the people and lands along its banks. The task ought to be performed methodically. It ought to be taken up as a separate project, just as the Panama Canal was constructed, and levees should be built and maintained which are efficient for the purpose. There is no reason whatever why there should be floods along this river. Competent engineers have testified that if the Government would expend its money with a definite fixed plan and purpose within a term of five or six years these levees could be constructed so as to control absolutely the flood waters of the Mississippi, and at the same time give absolute protection to all that vast territory of rich lands over which without levees these waters would flow.

In determining the question of flood control in the Mississippi River there are other questions to be considered at the same time. One of these is the proper care and protection of those who live within the confines of these levees, and the other is the rights of riparian owners.

All of these questions would be under the specific jurisdiction of this committee, and it is, in my judgment, of vital importance to all those States that border on the Mississippi River. For these reasons I am heartily in favor of the bill.

I feel that I ought to say to the House that I can consider this question without reference to local conditions. Two years ago and four years ago I went before the Rivers and Harbors Committee and endeavored in every way I could to get assistance of Congress in aiding the city of Memphis in protecting itself from the flood waters caused by the building up of levees on the Arkansas side. Before the building of these levees, Memphis was high and dry, but the erection of levees caused the water to rise higher on the Tennessee side, with the result that after a number of years the upper part of our city was flooded; and two or three years ago we had a flood that greatly injured our water system, our gas system, our street car service, and caused thousands of people to be run out of their homes. It was estimated that the loss of property was over a million dollars in that one flood to the citizens of Memphis. These

facts were all brought before the committee, but Congress would not help us. Thereupon the city of Memphis bonded itself for \$1,500,000 and has erected within its borders for its protection a concrete levee that fully protects. These floods were thrown upon Memphis without any fault of her own. They came from some twenty-odd States of the Union. Memphis ought not to have been compelled to have spent this money for her own protection. But she has done so, and we are now protected, and for this reason I say that it is with no specific selfish reason that I favor the establishment of this committee. I do so because I believe it is the initial step of a practical, methodical, and sensible system of confining the flood waters of the Mississippi River.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL].

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I think the serious objection to this resolution is the fact that by reason of its brevity it is ambiguous and will give rise to confusion in construction and to conflict of authority in committees. That is quite evident from the queries propounded to the last gentleman who spoke, Mr. SPARKMAN. There is not a proponent of this resolution who will undertake clearly to define the jurisdiction of this committee. Is it intended to take away jurisdiction from the River and Harbor Committee as it exists at present? That committee, according to the rules, has jurisdiction as follows: "Subjects relating to the improvement of rivers and harbors." By custom and practice it has been assumed that that committee has jurisdiction of all subjects of legislation affecting the navigability of rivers and harbors and improving them for commerce.

Does any gentleman say it is the purpose of this rule to diminish the power of the River and Harbor Committee as it at present exists? If so, I would like for him to say so. If not, then perhaps it is intended to give this committee jurisdiction of subjects of which no present standing committee has jurisdiction. Then, what are the subjects? The language used here are two words, "flood control." The complete rule as amended would read, "Subjects relating to flood control other than appropriations therefor, to the committee on flood control." What do gentlemen intend to convey by the words "flood control?" Presumably to prevent damage arising from floods. Damages to what? Do they mean to riparian lands and contiguous sections, to preserve them from devastation of flood waters? Is that their meaning? We have had an agitation during the recent years asking Congress for legislation to aid in the reclamation of lands subject to overflow through drainage. Is it intended under the words "flood control" that this committee shall have jurisdiction of legislation seeking to extend aid in the drainage of land so as to prevent flood waters from going over them, impairing the fertility of the land and destroying the crops? If so, why not have said so? Why have used two words the meaning of which no Member is able to explain?

The chairman of the River and Harbor Committee [Mr. SPARKMAN] asked the gentleman from Tennessee having charge of the resolution if it was intended to give this committee control of any legislation affecting the navigability of rivers, and he said, "No."

Then why not have made the rule definite and said so? The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD] grew eloquent and made a fine speech about the importance of flood control, which we all admit. The devastations of flood waters, both local and along those rivers which are interstate in their character, and along which flows such vast volumes of water as to be a constant menace to property and life, arouse the sympathy and invoke the aid of every Member.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Just one minute. But while we all admit the dangers of flood waters and, in so far as we may, would seek to avert them, if it was the purpose to protect riparian lands or to aid in drainage, why not have made it definite and said so, so that we might know what was the jurisdiction of this committee. I now yield.

Mr. EMERSON. Then the gentleman favors flood control, does he?

Mr. SMALL. What is flood control, please?

Mr. EMERSON. I ask the gentleman if he favors flood control—the control of these waters that devastate the land and destroy the crops.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I have always had great sympathy with those localities which were subject to damage from these floods. As a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and as a Member of this House, I have voted millions of dollars for the protection of the Mississippi River, all of which was done under the guise of improving the navigation of the river and promoting commerce, and yet, in large degree, as we knew, it was really intended to control the flood waters of the Mississippi against riparian lands.

Mr. EMERSON. Why does the gentleman quibble over mere words? Why does he not suggest some way of changing the rule instead of criticizing it?

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen who have considered this probably have given it very serious consideration. I never heard of the resolution until yesterday afternoon, and I think the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors heard of it only yesterday after it had been considered and agreed to by the Committee on Rules. By way of parenthesis I might suggest that if the jurisdiction of a great committee of this House is to be diminished there should have been some consultation with the chairman of that committee. With the few minutes allotted to me I might suggest some amendment to this rule which would express in clear terms the jurisdiction of this new committee, but I would like to know in advance from the proponents of the rule what jurisdiction they wish to give it, and then I will try to formulate language which will express their thoughts. If the gentleman can say what he wishes the jurisdiction of this committee to be, I will try and express it for him. But a rule has been proposed, considered by the Committee on Rules, unanimously reported, and not a member of that committee can stand up and say what legislative jurisdiction is to be given to that new committee. Was it purposely of such brevity as to be made ambiguous, subject to conflicting construction? Were gentlemen who were proposing this rule really seeking to protect riparian lands from flood waters and secure action by Congress for drainage and afraid to put it in the rule either because of constitutional objection or for fear of creating prejudice or was it done ignorantly?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Does not the gentleman think that the language in the rule as proposed is quite as explicit as it is in the rule now relating to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, which is "to the improvement of rivers and harbors"? Who knows what that means?

Mr. SMALL. The improvement of rivers and harbors, if the gentleman is asking me for an answer, means by universal consent improvement for the purpose of making them more easily navigable and promoting commerce.

Mr. MANN. But the gentleman just stated that we have raised levees for the protection of adjoining property through the Rivers and Harbors Committee under that language.

Mr. SMALL. Well, nominally. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Then nobody knows what it means?

Mr. SMALL. Nominally it was for the improvement of the navigability of the river. Let us be frank and candid with one another. Every intelligent Member of this House has voted for millions of dollars for the Mississippi River, knowing what he was doing, knowing that a large part of that money was for the protection of those fertile lands along that great river against floods; and yet, because we realized that the problem was so stupendous that it was beyond the financial capacity of any State to protect its lands against that river, we have shut our eyes and have voted these millions of appropriations, and have done it gladly, under the guise of improving the navigability of the Mississippi. That is the truth, and every intelligent Member knows it is the truth.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. MEEKER. Inasmuch as the Committee on Rivers and Harbors have been doing that with their eyes shut, would it not be just as well to have a committee that might do it with their eyes open?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. But they do not have any power to appropriate anything.

Mr. SMALL. Then put it in your rule that that is the purpose of their jurisdiction. If the gentleman is a friend of this rule, let him propose an amendment to it defining its jurisdiction.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If that is the real purpose of the rule, would the gentleman object to the separation of the two lines of work?

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, if I understand the gentleman, I will make this answer: Take the great Mississippi River, if you please, and the Missouri and similar great rivers, interstate streams, the banks of which are subject to overflow, rivers which carry such immense volumes of water that in time of flood they are capable of and do inflict great damage to land and property and life.

I have always believed that by some means Congress ought to take jurisdiction of that matter in a way to solve the problem



as a great national problem ought to be solved. But the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in the past has been criticized because it has reported large appropriations for such streams, and river and harbor improvements have been prejudiced before the country to some extent by reason of those criticisms. Personally, I have said, and I doubt not it has been the sentiment of other Members of the House, that it would be best that the question of protecting riparian lands, property, and life from the devastation of these rivers in flood time, while a national problem, ought to be divorced from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and if this rule were so expressed as to include such activity, so that Members could intelligently know that for which they were voting and could feel that no conflict of jurisdiction would arise, I would gladly vote for this rule and would think it a proper rule.

Mr. OGLESBY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Certainly.

Mr. OGLESBY. If it were divorced from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, under what provision of the Constitution does the gentleman think that this work of flood prevention could be carried on and money appropriated therefor out of the Federal Treasury?

Mr. SMALL. I can not go into that question; and yet I may say just briefly, that for a great river like the Mississippi River I think authority could be found for it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMALL. Will the gentleman from Florida yield me five minutes more?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I can only give the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. I yield one minute to the gentleman.

Mr. SMALL. Then, Mr. Speaker, I have three minutes.

Now, unless necessary I would like to proceed without interruption, because there is just one more thought I want to give to the House. I said that this rule, in the language which it contains, would give rise to confusion and conflict of jurisdiction. Flood control, as I tried to explain, might and does mean protection against damage to contiguous land, and perhaps by any means which may be deemed advisable and proper, but flood control also involves the maintenance of channels in rivers. There are various important rivers in the United States, the improvement of which Congress has assumed the jurisdiction where flood waters are not overflowing the banks, but yet are constantly changing the location of the channel; sand bars are created and various diversions of the channel are brought about, and the maintenance of those channels involves the removal of those bars and other obstructions caused by flood waters, in order that an open channel may be maintained for navigation and commerce. And they are very important rivers, and there is your question of flood control. Will this new committee claim jurisdiction of flood control against damage to the channels of navigable rivers? If not, why not? If not, why not fix this rule so that such a construction can not be given to it, but under this language proposed this committee can have, and we know will claim, jurisdiction of flood control as it affects the channels of navigable rivers.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this rule was insufficiently considered. As I say, I do not know whether this language, brief as it is—and as I believe everyone will admit, because no Member has arisen to deny it—is ambiguous and will involve conflict of jurisdiction. I say that this rule as reported did not receive sufficient consideration, or else it was done inadvertently, or else it was done purposely in order to keep the real purpose of this rule within the constitutional jurisdiction of Congress, or in order to invade the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMALL. And gentlemen can take either horn of that dilemma. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have neither the desire nor the time to criticize the language of this rule, as some who oppose it have done. I understand that it was reported to the House by the unanimous vote of the Committee on Rules, and I believe that they understand the English language well enough to express the purpose of this rule. It reads for flood control. I do not believe there is a man in this House who does not know what a flood is, neither is there a man in this House who does not know what control means, and the purpose of this rule is to try to control the great floods that carry devastation through some part of the country almost every week of the year. You can hardly find a newspaper for any one

week that does not give an account of a flood somewhere in Ohio, Arizona, Georgia, Kentucky, Missouri, or somewhere else. I shall not speak of them, but I will speak for a moment about the grave importance of the floods that often devastate a portion of the district, that I have the honor to represent, upon the Mississippi River. I believe that you do not always stop to think of the serious aspect of these great floods. I want to call your attention to a brief sentence in a report made by Ernest Bicknell, the national director of the American Red Cross, after the great flood of 1912. I read this sentence:

In speaking of the number of people who were driven from their homes in that flood, while the number of persons requiring temporary help in the form of food and shelter was approximately 250,000, the number for whom further help in the form of seeds for planting, repairs to buildings, fences, furniture, clothing, farm implements, and so on, was necessary, may be estimated at approximately 50,000 people.

There is a flood in the Mississippi Valley to-day only 1 foot lower than it was at that time. It is rising every day now and promises to be a record-breaking flood in the Mississippi Valley. If that flood of 1912 drove from their homes 250,000 people, whom the Red Cross helped to relieve, I have no doubt that there is the same number of people in that country driven from their homes to-day. I do not know how many, but believe that there are hundreds of people to-day from my district in the hills of Kentucky, where they have fled to get out of the water and to save their lives. It is a dreadful condition. There is in Missouri, appointed by the governor, a waterways commission. That commission made a report of the results of the flood of 1912, and in that report they state that the damage to the five counties in my district affected by the flood of 1912 was \$13,255,000. More than \$13,000,000 in five counties in one flood. We have had several floods since and have one now. I speak of this to show you the great importance of flood control. I have great respect for the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors; I have great respect for every member on that committee. They have relieved us as best they could, but that committee was required by the rules that gave it power only to entertain and consider bills for the improvement of rivers. They have often said they could not consider bills that were exclusively for the control of floods unless they also affected the navigation of rivers. If it is true that you have got to have written in the rules, as my friend from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] seems to understand, everything that a committee of this House can do, then the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has never had any power whatever to consider bills for the relief of flood sufferers or for protection from floods, because that rule only gives that committee power to consider bills for the improvement of rivers and harbors. I hope this resolution will pass, so as to give us a committee with undoubted jurisdiction over flood control.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how the time stands now?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee has 44 minutes and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] has 35 minutes remaining.

Mr. GARRETT. Has the time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] expired?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. GARRETT. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] has just spoken in reference to the necessity for some committee which has jurisdiction over the investigation of floods of this country. I wish to supplement that very briefly by calling the attention of this House to a condition that is now prevalent in the State of Indiana. There are more than 300 people in the little city of Martinsville to-day who have been driven from their homes. There are more than a thousand families along the Wabash River that have been driven from their homes. The Wabash River is denominated a navigable stream, but it is not navigated. So there is absolutely no chance for relief for the flood conditions along the Wabash River through the medium of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, because of the fact that they have not the jurisdiction to relieve the flood condition because it is not interfering with the navigability of that stream. And what may be said of the Wabash River may be likewise said of the White River, that is causing the devastation down at Martinsville. As to the flood spoken of by the gentleman from Missouri, we had a like one all along the Wabash River and throughout the State of Ohio. The city of Dayton was almost wiped out, many people lost their lives, and thousands of people not only had their homes destroyed but other property as well.

Mr. SWITZER. Will the gentleman say that this flood-control committee would have jurisdiction over the Miami River at Dayton, Ohio?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Of course they would have jurisdiction over the Miami River. There is not a river but finds its outlet to the sea, and of necessity finds its outlet in a navigable stream.

Mr. CURRY. The Miami River is all in one State, is it not?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Suppose it is?

Mr. CURRY. That is what we want to get at.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. My idea is that it is the purpose of government to subserve the interests of its people, and that it is the purpose of government to protect its people. It is the purpose of this preparation we are now talking much about to protect our people against the invasion of a foreign foe. We have the same jurisdiction, it seems to me, to protect our people from the invasion of the elements, from the invasion of high water. After the flood of 1913 the various States—Ohio, Indiana, and these other States—appointed scientific men for the purpose of studying the causes of these great floods. The floods are increasing constantly in number, and constantly in violence, by reason of the fact of the great drainage that is going on in the country constantly, taking the water that used to percolate through the ground and take months and months to get away, now drains suddenly into these streams. The rain that preceded the great floods of 1912 was an ordinary rain. It commenced on Saturday night and continued for about four days. It was not a hard rain anywhere. There have been harder rains throughout our country many times, and the same experience was had in the State of Ohio.

Mr. CURRY. It has been the understanding in Congress in the past that they have no authority to appropriate for flood control on waters within the confines of one State.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The same objection was raised the other day, in that we had no authority to appropriate money for the improvement of highways entirely within one State, and it was said that the only way that jurisdiction could be extended was by reason of the fact that it might possibly be used for a post road.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The town of Seabright, on the coast of New Jersey, was inundated last year, and a great deal of damage was done, with some loss of life. Does the gentleman think this new committee would have jurisdiction to afford relief in a case of that kind?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I think it would. There is not any question but that the United States has jurisdiction to improve harbors that are entirely within the jurisdiction of one State. Why? Because they have taken jurisdiction of those harbors.

Mr. CURRY. That is according to the Constitution. They have the control over navigable rivers and harbors.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It strikes me, gentlemen, that the quibble as to the constitutionality of this question is very far-fetched, for certainly the Government can find within its organic law a means by which it can protect these people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess].

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I live between the Little Miami and the Great Miami Rivers, in Ohio, within 17 miles of Dayton. Dayton was visited three years ago by one of the most destructive floods that city has known. Columbus is only a little distance from us, on the Scioto River, and it was visited by a like flood. It is not a question of whether we have a constitutional jurisdiction over those rivers, because they do empty into a navigable stream, the Ohio River. I shall vote for this rule, because it presupposes an increase of work due to an increase of floods. Floods are growing to be more disastrous every year, largely due to the deforestation of the country and also to the system of drainage, and, I might say, the encroachment of civilization upon our navigable streams. It seems to be that this is cumulative, and if it does take some work away from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors it would not hurt that committee. It will relieve the Rivers and Harbors Committee and give fuller opportunity to meet this growing necessity caused by the increase of injuries every year due to floods. Therefore I shall

freely vote for the measure, believing that I am justified in so doing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have always believed that the Federal Government sooner or later would have to change the somewhat narrow policy it has pursued in the past in regard to our rivers and inland streams. I believe it will be necessary to view the river and its tributaries as a scientific whole. Of course, the great trunks are navigable streams.

I know that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has jurisdiction of the improvement of the navigable streams, or such portions of the navigable streams as they think commercial conditions require should be improved. But that is rather a narrow conception of the possibilities of improving the rivers. There are a great many streams of which the commercial possibilities would not justify improvement, and upon which there might be an increasing demand upon the Committee on Rivers and Harbors that they be improved under the color of commercial improvement. Unquestionably there are a great many tributaries of streams which are navigable and which cause the disturbance of navigation by flood conditions, but which are not themselves navigable from a commercial standpoint. So that the points of conflict, as I see them, between the jurisdiction of this proposed committee and the jurisdiction of the existing Committee on Rivers and Harbors are very few. So far as I can see, they are limited to the one single exception of the Mississippi River below Cairo.

So far as I know, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has not undertaken upon any broad scale works connected with both navigation and flood protection except upon the lower Mississippi. So far as I know, upon all the other propositions which the Committee on Rivers and Harbors handles, they limit it entirely to the question of navigation, and this leaves out two great elements of the control of the rivers. One is the reclamation of the adjoining land and the other is the control of floods, so far as damages to cities and crops are concerned. It is that particular portion which this new committee is designed to handle.

As to the constitutionality of any plan of flood control, I would not undertake at this time and in this brief moment to discuss it; but I do know that we have expended more than \$100,000,000 in trying to put water onto irrigable land, where there was no water and which land in many cases was in private ownership. This could not be justified purely as an improvement of our own Government land. If we have that power, we certainly have the same power to take water off land where there is too much water.

As to the commercial demand and necessity for it, there is no question. These floods are devastating and damaging to a great extent. Year after year the producers and toilers and commercial people of this country suffer heavy tribute in the damages caused by these floods, and a tribute of which the State or the community can not relieve them. Where water congests at a great junction point, like the mouth of the Kaw and the mouth of the Missouri, where is located Kansas City, Mo., and Kansas City, Kans., the cause is not within local control. The waters causing the floods do not come from the States of Missouri and Kansas, but they come from the States of Iowa and Nebraska and Montana and the Dakotas. We have not control over the conditions that produce that flood. When the lower Mississippi is suffering from flood it is because the great torrents of the Missouri with all of its tributaries have poured in there. The Illinois and the Wisconsin and the Ohio have thrown their great tributary waters into the Mississippi. The people who chance to live in the Mississippi Valley, at St. Louis or at Cairo, for example, are not suffering from water collected in their community, over which they have control, but from water collected all over the Mississippi Valley higher up. That tribute every year is enormous, and it is a question for the American people whether they will make up their minds to stop the cause, and to effect the control of the floods by a broad scientific system of governmental activity, or whether the work should be limited to State, municipal, or local control, which has been wholly ineffectual in the past.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET].



The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Rules, which reported this rule, and one who was present and voted to report it, I desire to say that nothing that I have heard in the debate has at all made me regret that vote.

I think that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] can be very readily answered in all of his arguments. He says that no one can define "flood control." Why, the gentleman is an able and a distinguished lawyer, and he knows that the best test of a phrase in a statute is to ascertain what has ordinarily, necessarily, or usually been done under that phrase. Now, in the River Danube and other rivers in Europe they have been working out the problems of flood control for over 500 years, and therefore what has ordinarily, necessarily, or usually been done under the head of flood control has a mass of precedents behind it, reaching back to a time prior to the discovery of the United States of America. If we had endeavored to put into the rule all of the things that have been done under the head of "flood control" which the gentleman from North Carolina says we should have done, we would have had a rule longer than the justly celebrated bill reported by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] in relation to printing, and we would not have gotten it up even for consideration in the House. There is nothing in that objection.

As to the time devoted to discussion, this question of flood control has been discussed in this House to my knowledge for 10 years, and certainly that is long enough for the ordinary Member of Congress to make up his mind.

Mr. OGLESBY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York yield to his colleague?

Mr. BENNET. I will yield for a question.

Mr. OGLESBY. Under what particular provision of the Constitution have the men who have advocated this flood control during these long years thought they could get money out of the Federal Treasury?

Mr. BENNET. Without taking too much of my precious time, for I have only five minutes, I will say to the gentleman that if he will read the somewhat celebrated reply of Mr. Webster to Mr. Hayne he will find that subject far more adequately discussed than I can discuss it in my brief time. I must decline to yield further, because I have not the time.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want to ask the gentleman an easy question.

Mr. BENNET. If I yielded to the gentleman, I would have to yield to others, and so, without meaning any discourtesy, I must decline to yield.

I voted for this rule in the committee because it seemed to me that it was right; and not only is it right, but it affords me one opportunity at least, representing the largest Democratic congressional district in the State of New York, and, so far as I have found out, the largest Democratic congressional district in the United States, to vote according to the Baltimore platform of the Democratic Party on one subject.

I have been informed by those who were here in the Sixty-third Congress that it was not at all times possible apparently for gentlemen on the other side of the aisle to vote in accordance with the provisions of the Democratic platform. I know it will please the 27,757 enrolled Democrats in my district to know that I am able to vote in accordance with that provision of the Democratic platform which says:

We hold that the control of the Mississippi River is a national problem. The preservation of the depth of its water for the purpose of navigation, the building of levees to maintain the integrity of its channel, and the prevention of the overflow of the land and its consequent devastation, resulting in the interruption of interstate commerce, the disorganization of the mail service, and the enormous loss of life and property, impose an obligation which alone can be discharged by the General Government.

And I may say to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL], in answer to his question, and to my colleague from New York [Mr. OGLESBY] that they both probably can find an answer to their several questions in the platform, which no doubt they heartily advocated on the stump both in 1912 and 1914. [Applause.]

Equally strong declarations the same way are in the platforms of the respective parties of the 13,968 Republicans and of the 2,345 Progressives. In voting to create this committee I am voting to carry out the platform pledges of the parties whose aggregate enrollment comprises about 90 per cent of the voting strength of the district. As I am old-fashioned enough to believe in carrying out party platform promises, this opportunity to do so gives me particular pleasure.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I would not take the time to address the House on this matter were it not for the fact that we have a flood situation in Delaware which is of a peculiar sort. A few minutes ago the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] asked about Sea Bright, N. J., which was devastated by a flood tide from the ocean accompanied by a northeast storm. We had a similar case at Rehoboth, in Delaware, where the entire ocean front for 5 miles or more was washed out last year, together with several blocks of city property and the houses thereon. We also have a flood situation in connection with the Rehoboth and Indian River Bays, in Delaware, and should the House create this committee on flood control, and the Federal Government be given additional authority through the creation of this new committee, I believe the situations mentioned above worthy of notice and consideration. I feel, therefore, that I should say a few words in the general debate on this resolution which I favor and intend to vote for.

In my opinion the question of flood control should be taken in charge by the National Government, and the circumstances that have been related here to-day by the Arkansas delegation in particular should impress those who are not familiar with the subject, and who are not touched by that particular matter. I realize that there will be differences of opinion between the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and this proposed committee on the matter of jurisdiction over certain bills, but in my opinion we should look beyond the mere interference of jurisdiction in the House here between committees, and consider this question as it relates to the country in its national importance.

As was shown in my few remarks on the road bill, I do not favor the Government going into expenditures such as that bill might have called forth. But flood regulation is a question that concerns people all over the country who live on navigable rivers and other streams. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, it concerns them vitally, for when people need relief from floods and the attendant circumstances it is generally in an emergency, and the relief must be immediately provided. All of us have the greatest sympathy for the people living in the great Mississippi Valley, whose lands are inundated and whose property is destroyed by floods many times in a single decade. The National Government is the only governmental agency that is capable of dealing with the flood situation, and it certainly is patent to all that the time has come for the creation of a committee in this House whose duty it will be to deal with this great problem.

I for one would be willing to enlarge the scope of this committee, for the rule as amended by this resolution does not give the proposed committee the power to make appropriations. At this point I beg to state that I trust no embarrassment will come to the members of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors by the creation of this new committee. I have listened to the arguments of the several distinguished members of that committee against this proposition, but I believe that the question of flood control is a question well unto itself and one which well warrants the creation of a committee of this House to consider matters relating thereto.

In the first part of my remarks I referred to the disastrous experience which befell Rehoboth Beach in my State. This is a large and populous summer resort located along the shores of the Atlantic Ocean. In the fall of 1914 a terrific flood tide, whipped into fury by a northeast storm of several days' duration, completely wrecked a large part of this town located along the ocean front, besides destroying the board walk and bulkheads, while a number of blocks of houses fronting along the ocean were swept bodily into the sea and their contents spread broadcast over the waters. The experience of this community in my State was only a repetition of what happened at Sea Bright, N. J., to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has referred, as well as other places along the coast. The citizens of this community in my State bravely set about repairing the damage wrought by this crushing blow, paying for the same out of their pockets. When the general assembly met in the following January, they were appealed to for State aid to erect a system of bulkheads which would protect the coast in the future. It was my great good fortune to be able to assist in the passage of this bill through the general assembly, as I was then serving as secretary of state and was in daily contact with the general assembly. I am glad that I am able to take part in a small way in advocating and assisting in the passage of this resolution, which is national in its scope, and if the committee on flood control can solve this problem which confronts a great portion of our country to-day its existence will be amply justified.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to oppose the adoption of this rule, very largely out of the great respect I hold for its proposer. Looking at the brief document submitted to us, I find that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], our honored and respected Speaker, is the author of the resolution. Out of regard for him personally I wish it were in my power to vote for the resolution. However, it does not seem to me that this is an opportune time for the introduction of such a resolution. I wish he had proposed it at the beginning of the session of Congress, when the various committees of this House were being made up. So far as I know it was not brought to the attention of the Members of the House until day before yesterday. The Committee on Rules evidently gave it very marked consideration and deep study, because one of the members takes particular pains to inform us that he was present when the rule was considered. Out of regard for the remaining members of the committee, I do not think we had better ask for a call of the roll of the attendance of the Committee on Rules when the matter was under consideration.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I should like to know if there was some member present at the meeting of the committee who favored this rule? I wanted to ask that question a moment ago, but got no opportunity.

Mr. MANN. Both gentlemen know that it would not be a legitimate question to be asked here in the House.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It would be legitimate to know who appeared—

Mr. MANN. Not under the rules of the House, and it would not be permissible for a member of either committee to state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Suppose the hearings had been published. Would it be permissible for us to read them?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, is this coming out of my time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair supposes so. The gentleman yielded.

Mr. TREADWAY. I did not yield for a general discussion of parliamentary procedure in the committee room.

I am very glad that the member of the Committee on Rules from New York [Mr. BENNET], who has recently spoken, is able in one respect to satisfy his 27,000 Democratic constituents. He said he was voting to sustain one plank in the Democratic platform by supporting this rule, as the platform adopted at Baltimore expressly states the party is in favor of flood control. Happy man! He can satisfy his Republican as well as his Democratic constituents. Why did he not speak of the large number of Republicans who, of course, voted for him? The Republican platform has a strong plank on the very same question to which he referred, namely, flood control of the Mississippi River. I quote the Republican plank on the subject:

The Mississippi River is the Nation's drainage ditch. Its flood waters, gathered from 31 States and the Dominion of Canada, constitute an overpowering force which breaks the levees and pours its torrents over many million acres of the richest land in the Union, stopping mails, impeding commerce, and causing great loss of life and property. These floods are national in scope, and the disasters they produce seriously affect the general welfare. The States unaided cannot cope with this giant problem. Hence we believe the Federal Government should assume a fair proportion of the burden of its control so as to prevent the disasters from recurring floods.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me this question is brought up at this time owing to the horrible conditions that we know to exist in some Western States. My colleague on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas, has shown you the conditions existing in his district, with which we all have the greatest sympathy. But, so far as I know, no request has been presented to this House looking for relief of that condition. If they need instant relief, why have they not introduced some resolution for that purpose? There is no man on this floor but will stand ready and willing to vote such assistance as may be desired, and no red tape of committee action will stand in the way of relieving the distress and suffering of our fellow countrymen.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the whole subject of that condition as it may exist there, now temporary in its nature, is being used as a means of appealing to this House to adopt a permanent rule, incorporating it in our rules, simply using present conditions as a psychological opportunity to appeal to the sympathies of the Members of the House. The member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Illinois, who eloquently debated the subject, seemed to consider that the establishment of a committee, calling it the committee on flood control, would of itself prevent

nature from allowing water to run down hill. It will not do it. [Laughter and applause.]

Further, I feel that there will arise conflict of authority and jurisdiction between this new committee, if created, and the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I have no feeling in the matter whatever, but I do think it fair to call attention to the fact that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has been very generous in its allotment of appropriations to the Mississippi River, the very cause for which it is evidently the intent of the proposers to establish a new committee.

Under the cloak of navigation we have made appropriations of millions of dollars and placed the amounts in the hands of the Mississippi River Commission, to expend in such manner as it might deem wise. It is, of course, true that the primary object of this commission is the construction of levees, revetment of banks, and similar work, all for the purpose of flood control and reclamation. Therefore, so far as fair treatment to the Mississippi River is concerned, the establishment of this new committee is entirely unnecessary.

I feel I must add one word of criticism to the method employed in securing such quick action on this proposed amendment to the rules. The resolution was introduced by Speaker CLARK on February 1; the Committee on Rules states that it considered it on February 2, and on February 3 action upon it comes up with only those Members having knowledge that it was to be considered to-day who were directly interested in its passage. It is not for me to criticize methods used at this time, but certainly a certain amount of courtesy is due fellow Members.

Knowing, as I do, the ability of the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee [Mr. SPEAKMAN], and appreciating the hard work he does in his capacity as chairman of that committee, I feel constrained to express regret that the advocates of the establishment of this new committee did not see fit to take him into their confidence. Mr. Speaker, irrespective of the merits of the proposition before us, certainly this courtesy should have been extended to that most courteous of all gentlemen, the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART].

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, if I were to argue in favor of this rule on the same basis as some members of the committee have I would be opposed to it, because I have no personal interest in it, as I represent a congressional district that is probably as nearly immune from serious floods as any district in the United States. However, long before I became a Member of this House I read—and have remembered it ever since, and hope I may remember it as long as I am a Member of the House—a statement by Mr. Justice Cooley, who said that when a man went to Congress and held up his hand and took the oath of office it became his patriotic duty to say, "Not what is best for my district only, but what is best for my country."

I see all over the country a growing danger and terror of floods. I apprehend that it is largely due to the fact that in building bridges, and so forth, we are encroaching too much on the channels of the streams, and that in building bridges we do not build them high enough. I am not one who believes that the committee created by this rule could have any means of controlling the elements, although I have seen stranger things happen on the floor of this House than an undertaking of that kind. But from what I have seen of the devastation of floods and the damages, and all that follows the ravages of such calamities, I am certainly in favor of this proposition, because, if it does no more, it will show to the people of the country who are sufferers from these floods that we, their Representatives, are interested in preventing distress wherever it is possible for Congress to do so.

Such a committee can find out and report on the possibility of flood prevention and protection; and surely such frequent misfortunes demand our prompt, earnest, and most intelligent action. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the Committee on Rules yesterday when it reported out this resolution. Had I been present, I should not have voted for it in its present form. I expect the rule will be adopted, but I am clear that it ought not to be adopted in the form in which it is presented. It is entirely clear to me, as I think it must be to the membership of this House after this debate, that in its present form it will give rise to great confusion between the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and this committee on flood control.

What is meant by flood control? If they speak of unusual floods that destroy levees and property I can not conceive of



a situation where navigation is not involved in that kind of flood. Do you seek to prevent floods by building reservoirs at the heads of the great rivers? That squarely involves the question of navigation. Do you want to prevent floods by revetments and levees on the Mississippi River? That, too, inevitably involves a question of navigation. Where will the Speaker draw the line in referring bills, with this new committee created? What will happen is that a bill will be presented having directly to do with navigation but declared upon its face to prevent floods. It will go to the committee on flood control, while the navigation proposition involved will be quite as important, perhaps, as that of flood control.

If we have a new committee at all on this subject, it seems entirely clear that the jurisdiction of each of these committees should be specifically defined. If I might have had the framing of this rule, it clearly would have provided that no bills relating to navigation should go to this committee. If that had been done, there would have been no objection to it. But, possibly, Mr. Speaker, the principal object of this new committee is to consider bills not for the prevention of the kind of floods I have spoken of but those kinds of floods, not unusual in their character, but which recur year after year, overflowing bottom land on some rivers; and the design of this may be to seek appropriations not for the saving of life and property but to reclaim lands, valueless to-day, and do it at the public expense without the lands contributing one dollar to the cost of their reclamation. I, of course, do not believe the author of the rule had this in mind. So while I expect the rule to be adopted, I do say it ought not to be adopted in its present form, and I prophesy now that it will give trouble in the future on the matter of jurisdiction if it be adopted. If this rule was defeated to-day, there would be no difficulty in the Committee on Rules again taking it up and framing a new rule and presenting it to this House defining the jurisdiction of these respective committees. [Applause.]

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. CURRY. Does the gentleman think the adoption of this rule would transfer jurisdiction of the Rivers and Harbors Committee over the flood control of navigable streams, the waters of which rise and flow through one State only?

Mr. LENROOT. I think it would.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. HULBERT. I would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks this situation could be more effectively dealt with if the duties of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors were divided so that we would have a Committee on Rivers and a Committee on Harbors?

Mr. LENROOT. That might be a very good suggestion.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall not undertake, in five minutes, to discuss the technical phraseology of this resolution. I am in favor of the resolution and expect to support it not simply because of any emergency that may exist at the present time but because of the possibility that exists all of the time of an emergency being created in the matter of floods. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] a moment ago suggested that no bill or resolution had been introduced here for the relief of flood sufferers in the localities where the conditions exist. The gentleman is mistaken about that. I am sure a number of resolutions and bills have been introduced. I know that two have been introduced by myself. I know the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TAYLOR] has a resolution, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] has introduced resolutions. Every man whose people are affected by the floods that are now in progress, and that come every year, have introduced resolutions seeking to relieve the people who are involved in the floods. But it is a difficult proposition to get a bill through this House, or the Congress, for the relief of any particular locality; and there is only one form of efficient relief that can come in the long run, and that is relief that takes care of the whole situation and prepares the Government to take care of the situations whether they be local or general in their nature.

In addition to what the gentleman from New York said a while ago about the platform of the Democratic Party upon this subject, I desire to call attention to the platform of the Republican Party. In 1912 both political parties now represented on this floor took the position that the Mississippi River, being a stream that drains 31 States of the Union and 41 per cent of the territory of the United States, is of sufficient national importance to justify Congress taking it up as a separate proposition. I have no criticism to make of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I think they have performed

their duties as far as they could with efficiency and patriotism and with a desire to render the greatest benefit to the people of the United States; but here is a great stream that is not a local stream, the most treacherous stream that flows anywhere in the world, and now from the mouth of the Ohio River down to the Gulf of Mexico the water of 31 States of the Union is flowing through it, and by reason of the fact that heretofore the Government has constructed levees along the Mississippi River and thereby invited men to build up their homes and cultivate the soil adjacent thereto and which is now in danger, I think there is such a national problem as ought to be dealt with by Congress.

In the city of Hickman, in my district, a city of more than 6,000 people, every able-bodied man is at this moment at work seeking to protect the levee that has been constructed by the Government from destruction by the Mississippi River, and the consequent inundation of hundreds of thousands of acres of land and the homes of the people in that city. They do it not only in the daytime but in the nighttime. They do it every year; and as Judge RUSSELL suggested a moment ago, there are thousands of people from his district and from Arkansas and Missouri who have gone across the Mississippi River and are now seeking refuge in the hills of Kentucky. Is not that a national problem—to undertake to care for those people, to undertake to preserve their property and lives—and is it fair to expect the local communities, which are doing everything they can and which have exhausted their powers of taxation and their resources from a charitable standpoint and from every standpoint, to take care of the situation created by the water of 31 States which flows by their doors and inundates their homes? We speak a great deal about preparation for national defense. Mr. Speaker, there are other enemies of the country than foreign enemies, and the Mississippi River is one of the most fearful enemies to the people who live in its valley, and I think we should protect them as far as is possible from its recurring ravages. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON].

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I can not hope, in the limited time allowed me under the rules, to say what I desire to say upon this question. Sometime during this session I am going to ask the privilege of addressing the House at more length upon the importance of the question of flood control to the people of my State and district. I do not believe there is a question that will come before this Congress that is of more vital interest to the people I represent than that of flood control. If you gentlemen when you go back to your offices will get a map of the United States and look right at the center of the country, at that point situated in the lap of the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers where they come together at the extreme southern part of Illinois, you will see the district that I have the honor to represent. It consists of the eight lower counties of the State, five of which border upon the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers. I can not state exactly what part of the district is lowland and what part is highland, but I will say that perhaps a fourth of my district, if not a third, is what might be called lowlands, and a great part of this would be subject to overflow from the floods and back waters of these two great rivers were it not for the protection which they receive from the levees that have been constructed.

Mr. Speaker, that part of Illinois has been under cultivation since the early part of the century; and I want to say that there can not be found anywhere in the United States more beautiful, more productive, or better improved farms than those along the bottoms of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers in the southern part of Illinois; and there can not be found anywhere a class of farmers that are more thrifty, industrious, persevering, and patriotic than those who have reclaimed those fertile fields from the floods of the father of waters, protected them as best they could by the construction of levees, and converted them into beautiful and prosperous farms. Mr. Speaker, these farmers of my district have liberally expended hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars in the construction of levees along the two rivers, and the money they have saved and invested in their homes and other improvements are dependent for protection upon the frail levees which they have built with their own means. But year after year the great flood of waters that comes sweeping down the Mississippi River from the north and the Ohio River from the east is a source of constant terror to the people of these valleys, not infrequently washing away the banks of the rivers, altering or dividing the thread of the streams, and eating into and destroying the levees which the people have built. And, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that in my judgment a great deal of the money which the farmers of that region have expended in the construction of levees for the pro-



tection of their farms will, before long, have been wasted unless the National Government takes hold of this flood question and assists in protecting from the ravages of these waters the levees that have already been built, and helps to build them higher and stronger.

Now, this question of controlling the flood waters of the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers is not a local question. It is one of the Nation's problems. It has long been recognized to be such, but has never been properly handled. I believe that the time has come when the Federal Government should take hold of this, one of its greatest problems, and solve it. The control of the flood waters of the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers and their tributaries should be made a separate national project, like the building of the Panama Canal or the Alaskan Railroad. A plan should be worked out by which a coordinated system of levees and other river improvements would be constructed under scientific and continuous methods, and I do not doubt that the floods of these great rivers can ultimately be controlled, millions of acres of rich land reclaimed, and millions of dollars saved to the people each year.

Mr. Speaker, if the Members of Congress could happen to be in the Mississippi Valley during the winter and spring floods, when the melting snows from the mountains of the West and the rains from the plains of the North and Northwest come roaring down the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers to join those from the Ohio, Tennessee, and other rivers from the East, and see the terrible destruction of property and even the loss of life that the people of those valleys suffer, I do not believe that there is one of you who would not know that the question of controlling these annual floods is one for the whole Nation to solve and that it ought to begin doing so right now. Even while we are discussing this question, I am advised that the flood has reached 53 feet at Cairo and that the people all up and down the valley are being driven from their homes, while stock and grain and other property are being washed away.

No one who has not lived there or been there during these trying times can fully appreciate the awful terrors and the suffering and privation to which those people are exposed when these unusual floods occur. Yesterday I received a telegram from the president of the Chamber of Commerce of Cairo appealing to me to ask the War Department to send the Government boats from places where they were stationed on the river to aid in rescuing the people and the stock from their perilous positions in the flooded districts. I called upon the Acting Secretary of War, and I want to say that he responded promptly and assured me that instructions would be sent forward to give aid wherever possible. I found that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and other Members from Kentucky, Missouri, and Arkansas were urgently appealing to the War Department for its assistance in this great calamity. Mr. Speaker, the people of the city of Cairo are not asking any aid for themselves. They are doing so for others who are not so well protected from the floods as they. Cairo has heretofore appealed to Congress for aid, and aid was generously given when asked; and I want to say here that every citizen of that thriving busy little city is profoundly grateful for the assistance Congress has given them, which, with the aid received from the State of Illinois, has enabled them to raise and strengthen the levees which protect the city. This has been a heavy burden upon the people of Cairo, but they have met it bravely and cheerfully.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there can be found anywhere a braver, more courageous, persevering, hopeful, and resourceful people than those of Cairo and other cities and towns in that valley, who year after year have spent their money, patrolled their levees, and day after day and night and day fought back the waters which almost half the Nation sends down upon them in a mad rush to the sea. I hope that whenever the Members of this House chance to pass that way they will take the time to stop off in Cairo and see what a wonderfully thriving, prosperous, and attractive little city has been builded at the confluence of those two great rivers by the virtues and the capital of its citizens, with the aid of the State and Nation. And, Mr. Speaker, a visit to Cairo, with its prosperous mills, factories, railroads, and river commerce, and its 25,000 busy and contented people, working by day and by night with faith in the protection of their wonderful levees, the gem and future metropolis of the Mississippi Valley, would, I think, be the strongest argument that could be offered for national aid in the construction of levees wherever they are needed for protection from the floods of these great rivers.

I think the time has come for the Government to declare its policy toward the Mississippi River. We can not hope for help from the Rivers and Harbors Committee, whose jurisdiction extends only to questions of navigation and commerce. I had

occasion, Mr. Speaker, to take a trip down the Mississippi River this last fall from Grand Tower to Cairo, in company with some of my constituents who have studied this river question all their lives and are deeply interested. We were on a Government boat and accompanied by the Army officer in charge, and a representative of the Mississippi River Commission. I pointed out different places along the River where a little work by the Government would save a great deal of protection work that had been done in former years and now only needed repairing. I called attention to places here and there, where the Government, by a small expenditure, could prevent a cutting of the bank, or diversion of the channel, or save the levees of some of the drainage districts from ruin, and protect thousands of acres of fertile farms from overflow. To all of these suggestions we were met with the same old reply that under the present policy of the Government the department could only consider questions of navigation; that it would aid navigation for the river to remain crooked and the waters be held back, even though they did overflow and destroy the farms of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I think this whole question should be taken out of the hands of the Rivers and Harbors Committee; it should be divorced from the question of navigation. A separate committee should be provided to handle all questions of flood control. And if it should be found that the problem of flood control and the problem of navigation or commerce conflict, then it would be for Congress in its wisdom to harmonize them in the interest of the greatest number of the people. I hope the House will adopt this resolution and appoint this new committee, and that the committee when appointed will enter upon an investigation of this great national question and report out a bill at this session that will at least offer the people of the Mississippi Valley some hope for the future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I would like unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee has 23 minutes and the gentleman from Kansas 15.

Mr. GARRETT. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GOODWIN]. [Applause.]

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, in the very limited time allowed me I shall not attempt to go into elaborate detail and explain to the House the awful condition in which some part of my district is placed, one county in part bordering on the Mississippi on the east and two counties bordering upon the Red River upon the west, because in a measure that has been detailed to you by my colleagues, Messrs. TAYLOR and CARAWAY; and the same condition that affects their district likewise affects mine. I think the passage of this resolution, and the creating of the committee on the control of floods will be a long step in the right direction. As time goes on we become more and more progressive, and we yield to the needs of people who are stricken. In the evolution of government we can not be guided by the past nor by precedent alone, we must make a step forward. Some gentlemen have said that inasmuch as they live remote from the overflow districts or from inundations, up in the mountainous sections of this great country, their people should not bear part of the burden of those who live upon the lowlands.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to say that no considerable number of the membership of this House have such a narrow and restricted view and vision. Who is thy neighbor? I can not answer that, nor can you, half so well as that great Teacher of men who while on earth answered the question for all time to come. Upon one occasion He was asked by a lawyer who sought to confuse and mystify Him by saying, "Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" And the Savior said, "Hast thou read the law, and art thou familiar with the scriptures?" He said, "Yes; I have read them." "What do they say?" "Why, the law says, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy mind, with all thy strength, and with all thy soul, and thy neighbor as thyself.'" The great Teacher said, "Thou hast answered correctly." But, Mr. Speaker, not content and still determined to mystify his Maker, he said, "Master, who is my neighbor?" Now, the Master never answered any question directly; His answers to all questions were not local, but were intended for all time, for generations then not born. He said, "Upon one occasion a man came down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and he fell among thieves, who stripped him of his raiment and inflicted wounds upon his body; and, leaving him half dead, they went away. Presently



a priest came along, and, deaf to the importunities of the suffering man, he passed on the other side. Later on a Levite came by, and he, too, turned a deaf ear to his importunities. Then a Samaritan came along. He did not turn from him, but he went in his direction and gave relief and succor to the stricken man. He put on his raiment, bound up his wounds with oil and ointment and wine. He set him upon his beast and took him to a near-by inn and stayed there over the night; and on the morrow as he left he placed 2 shillings in the hand of the host and said, 'Take this for thy trouble, and upon my return I will pay you the residue,' and he went his way. 'Who,' said the Saviour, 'was this man's neighbor?' 'Manifestly,' the lawyer said, 'the man who gave succor and relief to the stricken one.' 'Then,' said the Lord, 'go thou and do likewise.'

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to say that the American Congress has always been responsive, duly responsive, to the great catastrophes that have come over this country. Need I recall that about two years ago we made an appropriation to the stricken people of Salem, Mass., where millions of dollars of property had been destroyed and thousands of poor people lost all of their worldly possessions and were driven out into the cold without money and without labor? [Applause.]

Why, Mr. Speaker, I have been criticized by those who now oppose me for voting for this bill, but I am glad that in my charity my heart goes out to stricken humanity wherever it may be found, and that my vision and my sympathies are not confined to the pigsty in my back lot, or even to my own front gate, but that in my generosity of soul and heart I would have this Government to extend a helping hand, as far as it is able so to do, where great bodies of people are sorely stricken by sudden catastrophes, where the local communities or the States are unable to give succor and relief.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, how many people it would take to pay only one dollar of that appropriation that was voted for the poor, unfortunate, homeless people of Salem, Mass., on account of that fire? I have just made the figures. We have 100,000,000 American citizens, and here was an appropriation for these stricken, unfortunate people, and it would take 500 people, all being taxed equally to contribute only \$1 of this amount. There are many communities in my own district, sir, which have a population of about 500, and if all of these 500 people contributed the same amount the whole 500 paid but \$1 of this appropriation. Sir, the Congress of the United States has upon many occasions voted money out of the Treasury for the relief of great communities which suffered from floods and fires and volcanic eruptions, not only in the United States but to many parts of the world beyond the American Continent. Sir, my own district, the county of Chicot and the eastern part of Ashley County, in 1911 and 1912, when I first came to Congress, received many thousands of dollars in supplies, food, and the like, furnished by the United States through an earnest effort put forth by me, when all of Chicot County and a part of the eastern part of Ashley County suffered from overflows and floods; and the people of the North and the East and the West came to our rescue down there with a generous and an appreciative impulse.

Sixteen years ago the city of Galveston, Tex., was visited by a great flood which almost destroyed that great city, and you, sir, Mr. Speaker, and many other gentlemen now upon this floor were Members of Congress at that time; and you gentlemen of the North and from the West and from the East responded liberally to the stricken people of that southern city. Ten years ago next April the great city of San Francisco was visited by an earthquake, and I do not have to repeat the awful condition visited upon many of the citizens of that metropolis nor the aid and appropriation made by Congress then in their behalf. Nor need I speak of the generosity of Congress upon several occasions when fire and flood and volcanic eruptions have visited other parts of the world, notably in Martinique, Italy, in Sicily, and other places. The generous hand of this Government was responsive to the suffering thousands where their own Governments were unable to properly care for their own suffering humanity.

I only speak of this, Mr. Speaker, in reply to those upon this floor who take a narrow and less generous view of the duty of the Federal Government now in their opposition to the creation of this committee on the control of floods, for the reason, they say, the Federal Government has no authority and no right to give aid and protection to build levees; likewise as an aid and protection for the prevention of floods, when back of those levees live many millions of people who by the labor of their hands help to feed and clothe the world, and who likewise defend our country's flag in times of war and make her glorious in times of peace.

Sir, we must keep step with the demands of the times and with the growth of civilization. Unfortunately for the people of this country as well as for the people of all countries, legislation has been confined largely to the protection of property rights to the exclusion of human rights. One of the great questions to-day confronting the American Republic and to which the Congress of the United States must give increasing attention is the question of conservation—not to conserve one or two or three material aspects of the question, but conservation in its broadest and most liberal sense—to come to the assistance of the States and communities in the conservation of our soil, to prevent its erosion, and the conservation of our Government-owned forests in a system finally of reforestation; to the conservation of our mines by seeing that these are not monopolized by the greed and avarice of a few men who, unfortunately, already have seized too much of this part of the public domain, appropriating the same to their own use and behoof; to the conservation of the waters of the country, not only to prevent overflows and inundations, but likewise, Mr. Speaker, to house and reservoir these waters, that the same may be let loose from time to time not only as an aid to navigation, but to the irrigation of the dry and arid lands of many parts of our country, notably in the western and southwestern portions of the United States; and last, but not least, sir, to the conservation not only of these property rights, a few of which I have named, but, higher and above all these, to the conservation of the rights and liberties and the possibilities of the people in human endeavor, in the lengthening of their lives, and in the restoration of the health and the giving of renewed strength and vigor to the physical activities of the people.

I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that this view is a little more liberal and possibly a little more broad than some of my friends here in the House will agree to; but what, sir, is the function of government, for what purpose were governments created and instituted, if not for the protection of the people, to give hope and courage to their aspirations and to their ambitions. And I hope the time will never come, sir, when, as a Member of this House, in keeping with the Constitution, which all of us have taken an oath to support, that I shall fail and refuse to lift my voice and to give my vote to those things of which I have spoken, conserving not only property rights, but granting to the people what the legislation of most countries has denied—still greater rights, the rights of humanity itself.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE].

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I am going to support this resolution because my district has suffered from floods more than any other district in Indiana. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OGLESBY].

Mr. OGLESBY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. OGLESBY] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I make a like request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GOODWIN] makes a like request. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen may have leave to print on this rule for five legislative days.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee asks that all gentlemen may have leave to extend their remarks in the Record on this subject for five legislative days. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER].

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am for this resolution. It seems to me that it is one of so great importance as any that could be introduced into the House. What scheme may be worked out in reference to flood control, of course, is only to be determined in the future by the action of this committee and finally by Congress. But it is such a large problem, especially in the Mississippi Valley, that the States, the municipalities, and the people generally, can not take care of it with the great amount of water that goes down the Mississippi River

from the tributaries that flow into that river. It is a matter of national importance.

The Federal Government has spent up to and including June 30, 1915, \$32,320,178 on the levees of the Mississippi River from Cape Girardeau to its mouth. The people living along this river have incurred a debt and spent \$91,105,990. In many of the localities they have taxed themselves every way possible to secure money to build these levees. Navigation can not be maintained on the Mississippi River without some plan to prevent the constant washing of its banks.

The burden of the building of these levees and attempting to prevent floods is so heavy that these people can not alone carry on this work. All parties in their platforms have declared in favor of flood control, or, at least, for the Federal Government having control of the problem of floods in the Mississippi. The value of reclamation of lands which are now overflowed would amount, if that work were done, to hundreds of millions of dollars throughout the United States. We have inaugurated the system of reclamation of lands in the West which has been of great benefit in that part of the country, but I submit that throughout all of the United States, and especially is this so in the great Mississippi Valley, that millions of acres of the very best land can be reclaimed if some feasible way is found whereby that work can be done. I do not know, and no Member of this House knows, what the future may develop in reference to flood control; but aside from the loss of property that occurs whenever these great floods come in the rivers there is a problem of the control of floods so that these lands may become farming lands—so they will become productive each year.

In the State of Illinois the Wabash and other streams overflow thousands of acres of the most productive lands in the world, and a feasible plan has not been found whereby these floods may be prevented and in that way these lands made profitable. The system of drainage which has been inaugurated in many places along these streams puts so much water in them and so quickly it is impossible as conditions now exist to prevent these serious overflows, and as a result millions of dollars of damage to the owner of the land occurs each year. No man in this House knows now what means may be worked out for preventing these serious floods, but it is to be hoped that a committee may study this problem and arrive at some solution of what can be done. Congress would hardly be expected to appropriate money for the drainage of private land, but it can at least afford information in some way whereby it can be done and, if necessary, assist the people as is now being done in the Reclamation Service. It is a problem that must be solved in the future, and we hope this will be a start in the right direction.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reforms come and go, and another reform has gone glimmering. When our Democratic friends obtained control of the House in the Sixty-second Congress the first thing they did in the interest of economy in the public service was to abolish the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River. That committee had been in existence for years under Republican control of the House. Now, after a few years have passed since this reform was inaugurated it is proposed to establish this same committee under a different name. And I congratulate the gentlemen on the other side of the House in now admitting that a few years ago they were mistaken when they attempted to leave no committee with jurisdiction over the flood and levee problems of the Mississippi River.

Mr. Speaker, I have served in this House under four distinguished Speakers—the great parliamentarian and Speaker, Thomas B. Reed; the gallant soldier and great Speaker, David B. Henderson, of Iowa; and the Speaker who, in my opinion, will always be ranked among the great Speakers and the great men of this country, the man with the iron nerve, my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. [Applause.] And I serve with pleasure under the present distinguished Speaker.

Gentlemen have said here to-day that this was a new proposition. Session after session, or term after term, the present distinguished Speaker of the House has introduced into the House bills, full in character, relating to the question of drainage and control of flood waters. I do not recall whether those bills have been referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors or not; but if so, they have been contributions to the waste basket. Whenever they have gone, no committee has had real jurisdiction to do anything with them. I am not in favor of the Government spending vast sums of money in the drainage of lands, either public or private, but we have reached the time in the consideration of our country when these problems must at least be investigated, and perhaps we shall be compelled to contribute something to their help, both on and off the Mississippi River.

The present distinguished Speaker of the House, whom we all admire and love [applause], seldom has made a request to this House involving his personal opinions or his personal desires. But the resolution reported to-day by the Committee on Rules reads:

Mr. CLARK of Missouri submitted the following resolution.

It is a resolution of the Speaker of the House. After long study of this subject of drainage and flood control, the Speaker of the House asks us to favorably consider a proposition to authorize a committee of the House to have jurisdiction over these subjects. I am quite willing, irrespective of the other merits of the proposition, to accede to this request of the Speaker, who so seldom makes personal requests of the House. [Applause.] And I hope that the resolution will be treated both as its merits and its source deserve, and that it may receive the unanimous vote of both sides of the House. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILSON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILSON] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the State of Louisiana is vitally interested in this problem, and the prosperity and welfare of her people are, in my opinion, largely dependent upon the passage of this resolution, the purpose of which is to create a committee the functions of which shall be to deal with the problems arising out of recurrent floods upon the Mississippi and other rivers in the United States. We have heard here this afternoon the statements of the gentlemen from Ohio, from Illinois, from Missouri, from Tennessee, and from Arkansas concerning the great volume of water coming down from the various streams in those States.

Mr. Speaker, all this flood of water, with all of its destructive force coming from all those States, and from 32 States of this Union, must eventually pass through the State of Louisiana, and this entire volume of water must, in its course, pass through the fifth congressional district of Louisiana, the great district which I have the honor to represent on this floor; and as this flood now proceeds from the rivers of those States, rushing into the mighty Mississippi, with Louisiana as its ultimate destination, there are at this hour, in order to protect our lands and the property and lives of our people on the line of levees from the imperial city of New Orleans to the Arkansas line, thousands of men who work by day and by night to avoid, if possible, the awful consequences of this oncoming flood. Mr. Speaker, this constitutes with us a flood problem, and we feel that if given a committee of this House, that could concentrate its collective thought and combined energies upon the problem of flood protection, this problem could be worked out and a final solution reached. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the State of Louisiana is in favor of this resolution. We have more at stake, in connection with this problem, we suffer more from floods, and expend more money on flood protection than any other State in this Union. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas, Judge TAYLOR, has just given a description of the loss of property and intense suffering of the people along the valley of the Arkansas River, and has told you that the flood waters of that stream must soon pass into the great Tensas Basin in Louisiana. I live in this great basin, and to show you that the charges made here by a few Members of the House that the appropriations asked for flood protection along the Mississippi is an attempt to secure money to drain private lands in the States affected is totally and wholly unfounded, I will explain that all the levee taxes collected in the Tensas Basin levee district, one of the largest districts in the State of Louisiana, is spent in building levees in the State of Arkansas, in the districts represented here by Mr. GOODWIN, Mr. CARAWAY, and Judge TAYLOR, and for the purpose of protecting the lands in that great district from just such floods as seem imminent at this time.

The fifth congressional district of Louisiana has a frontage of 200 miles along the Mississippi River, all protected by great levees, constructed by the State, the various levee boards, in connection with the Federal Government. The lands are taxed, the produce is taxed, and the citizens of that district are contributing voluntarily and gladly all the means and energy within their power, and it is our firm conviction, after years of study and experiment, that the rich domain of the Mississippi Valley, and the valleys of its tributary rivers can be protected, can be made available for habitation and cultivation, and that it will become, when so protected and made available for settlement and cultivation, the richest and the most prosperous section of this Republic; that it will add more to the national wealth and provide better homes for our overteeming population than can be secured by any other means or in any other section of this country. No one doubts that this is a national problem.



Every political party has so acknowledged in its platform and each President for four administrations has so declared, and it should and must be dealt with as such.

All the great engineers who have studied and dealt with this problem have been convinced and declared that these valleys can be protected, and experience with like problems in other countries confirm their opinions. The money and the means for this purpose should be provided, not as a donation or a gift, but in the high and noble discharge of a supreme national duty. The people of my district and of my State are fighting nobly and bravely for the solution of this problem. They remain behind these levees planning and working, carrying the problem with them day and night, striving with a courage and heroism unsurpassed in history, and they are there now with the full confidence and belief that this great Government will come to their relief and provide the means and protection that will add so much to its wealth, to its power, and to its greatness. No man can foresee or describe the possibilities of this section, but we can say that the time is rapidly approaching when this country can not develop and reach the ultimate extent of its manifest destiny without what this great valley, when finally protected and made available, will produce.

The tide of our population has reached its western limit and is now returning toward the east, and the rich lands of the Mississippi Valley is the most inviting field for settlement. Millions of dollars from the North, from the Central States, and from the East have been invested there, and the entire Nation is interested from every standpoint. This resolution is national in its scope and purpose, and will afford the means of solving one of the greatest problems now before the American people, and in the correct solution of which is lodged the prosperity and happiness of millions of our people and the conservation of the greatest asset to our national wealth.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MEEKER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MEEKER] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, I hope and believe that the adoption of this resolution will be the beginning of what I am persuaded every man considers the greatest internal improvement enterprise that this Nation has ever undertaken. I am sure that it lies back in the mind of every man who has given any attention to this flood problem that the present organization of committees of this House has made it practically impossible to do these things that everybody admits should be done with the flood problem, especially in the Mississippi Valley.

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors feel themselves naturally compelled to stay in the stream when much, if not most, of the work that needs to be done must needs at times be done at some distance from the stream. The improvement of navigation will be a part of this problem and incidental to the work that must come out of it. The conservation of land that will eventually be of almost priceless worth to the Nation will also be incidental. Both things will be wrought out eventually by a program that we as well as the business men of this Nation realize that we might just as well get ourselves ready to carry out, and that is to take care of that river problem from the Gulf upward, so that it can no longer devastate the hundreds of thousands of acres of the best land on earth, and save it for the people of the world, and not alone for those in that territory. [Applause.]

I hope that the resolution, which has been offered by a gentleman who certainly understands the English language, will pass, and that this rule will go through. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire about the time again?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee has 14 minutes, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] has 18 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. There will probably be only one other speech on this side.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended until this very moment to take any time on this resolution. The gentleman to whom I had given the time has just sent word that he will not be here.

I favored this resolution in the committee, and I favor it here, because I believe that it will result in some good. The question of the conflict of jurisdiction between the proposed committee and the Committee on Rivers and Harbors gives me very little trouble. The Committee on Rivers and Harbors no doubt does a great deal of good. The Mississippi River has been the recipient of a great deal of attention from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, with a view to promoting navigation. But

navigation has decreased as their attention to the river has increased in the last 25 years. There is practically no navigation on the Mississippi River.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I just wanted to ask the gentleman if he knew how much tonnage is carried on the Mississippi River?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not know what it is, but I know that it is not one-tenth of what it was 10 years ago.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thought the gentleman did not know.

Mr. CAMPBELL. And I know that it is not one-tenth of what it was 40 years ago. I know that if some committee having jurisdiction over the subject matter will undertake the prevention of floods, the inundation of large areas of land, that committee will accomplish some benefit to the people of the United States. The people are not suffering for want of navigation. The fact that they do not use the waters they already have justifies that statement. They do suffer from floods and overflows of streams throughout the entire country.

I accepted on one occasion a very important chairmanship of a committee in this House—the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River. A vast number of bills and resolutions were referred to that committee from every section of the United States. While it referred only to the Mississippi River, every stream that finally flowed into the Mississippi River claimed that it should have attention from the Congress of the United States, and those resolutions and bills were of course referred to the only committee that had anything to do with rivers at all and did not deal solely with navigation. The committee had no power to report bills, because it dealt with the improvement of the Mississippi River and all of its tributaries, under the authorities cited to the committee and such as were available to the committee, and that fact prevented any sort of action beneficial to the country, such as it is hoped will result from the creation of this committee and from the work that it shall do.

I do not belittle the work of the Committee on Harbors, but I magnify the importance of the work that may be done by the committee that is proposed to be created by this resolution, and I therefore give it my unqualified support.

Mr. Speaker, I turn over the remainder of my time, if I have any, to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has used six minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. I understand, and I suppose the House understands, that the previous question has been ordered. That was the agreement by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That was the agreement, that the previous question be considered as ordered.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] is recognized for 16 minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I am greatly obliged to Brother MANN for his compliments to me, and I endorse what he said about my three illustrious predecessors under whom I served.

This resolution or rule was introduced for the sole purpose of investigating what I think is the greatest economic question that the American people must deal with in the next quarter of a century; and for the subsidiary purpose of expediting the business of the House.

Before I forget it I wish to say that there is not a committee in the House, in my judgment, that works more faithfully, earnestly, and industriously than does the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. [Applause.]

The history of committees in this House is very interesting. In the first instance, and for years, there were no standing committees in the House. When Frederick Augustus Muhlenberg called the First Congress to order under the Constitution he presided over 56 men. Rhode Island and North Carolina had not yet gotten into the Union. After they came in he had a House of 65 Members. There are 435 Members of this House. The day that President Wilson and myself went over to Philadelphia to rededicate the old Congressional Hall I figured it out that if we had the same ratio now for membership that we had under the first census, and the same population we have now, we would have 2,776 Members in this House.

Government is not an exact science. It is an experimental science. The conduct of the House is not an exact science. It is an experimental science. Originally a special committee was appointed for every particular bill or resolution. That was all right as long as they had 65 Members or a few more. As the

membership of the House increased the standing committees came about as a result of parliamentary evolution. There ought to be enough of them to transact the business of the House, and no more. There ought not to be any dead committees around here.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is entirely correct in his criticism of the abolition of the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River. That committee had fallen into what President Cleveland called "inocuous desuetude," growing partly out of the fact of the narrow jurisdiction that it had, and partly out of the fact that the Speakers for some reason referred every bill that they could to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. The Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River ought never to have been abolished. Everybody makes mistakes, and that was one of the small mistakes that we have made since we got hold of the House. [Laughter.] It is a minor mistake. That committee ought to have been revived and its jurisdiction enlarged and made certain, so as to embrace the whole country. The other day I resurrected a sleeping committee in this House, the Committee on Railways and Canals. That committee has been in existence ever since I have been here, and if it ever did anything I never heard of it. Some gentlemen introduced bills about canals, and I referred them to the Committee on Railways and Canals. I think the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has been exercising that jurisdiction for some time; but I notified the chairman of the Committee on Railways and Canals that I wanted his committee to go to work and consider these bills, and he was very eager to do it. So much for that.

There are certain committees in this House—not very many—which are overworked; which have more work than they can attend to. In my judgment, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors is one of them. It does not have any subcommittees, so each member of that committee is supposed to be informed about all the rivers and harbors in America, and that is too much to expect of any 21 gentlemen.

The Committee on Appropriations is overworked, although I do not see any way in the world to relieve it. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is overworked. Sometimes gentlemen on that committee suggest that I take away bills that ought to go to that committee. I take away from it every bill that I have a good excuse for passing to any other committee, simply because that committee does more work than any other committee in this House, barring perhaps the Appropriations Committee. It has too large a task. Human energy has its limitations.

In the days gone by the House has not been at all tenderfooted about creating a new committee when it needed it. It may surprise some of you to know that originally the Ways and Means Committee discharged all the functions of the Committee on Appropriations. When the Civil War came on, however, it created such a vast amount of business that went to the Ways and Means Committee, and so much more business that ought to have gone to an Appropriations Committee that Hon. Thaddeus Stevens, one of the ablest men that ever sat in the House of Representatives, who was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee—perhaps it was on account of his poor health—had that committee cut in two—Ways and Means and Appropriations—and he chose to be chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. So for years the Committee on Appropriations reported all the appropriations in this House, until the Carlisle wing of the Democratic Party concluded they would clip the wings of Hon. Samuel J. Randall, who was chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, because he always moved to strike out the enacting clause of a Democratic tariff bill or to strike out everything after the enacting clause, which amounted to the same thing exactly. They did not want to demote him in terms, so they simply resorted to the process of clipping his wings, by giving the Committee on Military Affairs, the Committee on Naval Affairs, and other committees the right to bring in appropriation bills. All this is by way of preface.

In my judgment, the control of floods and incidentally the drainage of overflowed lands is, as I said before, the greatest economic question to which the American mind is going to be directed in the next 25 years. When I was a child my father used to put me to sleep of a night by singing to me a song that—

Uncle Sam is rich enough to give us all a farm—

And at that time Uncle Sam was rich enough to do that; but now all of his good land is gone, and men who have children lie awake o' nights studying about where their children are going to find homes in the days to come. Now, here we are. There is enough overflowed land on the Mississippi River and its tributaries—I take that simply because it is the greatest

river system on the face of the earth—every acre of that land equal to the best acre of land under the sun, to make a State as big as the State of Missouri, which has 69,815 square miles of territory. This overflowed land lies right in the heart of civilization, with churches and schoolhouses and railroads and markets, and all of the facilities for American life. If that land was drained and put under cultivation it would support a population of 25,000,000 human beings. Now, I do not believe that Congress is ever going to drain the public lands, or the private lands either at public expense, but I will tell you what I believe it will do. It will rig up a scheme like the irrigation scheme, except exactly the reverse as to the subject matter, by which these overflowed lands will be drained and the men who own the lands will pay for the drainage.

I am one of the men that got up the irrigation scheme. I was not very prominent in it for I was a new Member and green, but I did the best I could. It took years to get it. A man who took any part in that irrigation scheme can not ride from here to California over any great railroad route without rejoicing that he participated in that beneficent work. [Applause.]

The theory of irrigation is that all the irrigation works will be completed and not cost the Government a single cent. It is the same way with the drainage business. Last year, I undertake to say without fear of contradiction, that in the great States of Kansas, Missouri, Illinois, and Iowa alone there was destroyed a hundred million dollars worth of corn, wheat, and other foodstuffs that the people of the world ought to have had to eat.

The River and Harbor Committee had so much work to do—it was not any lack of intention, but it is so occupied with legitimate duties and it had a very shadowy kind of jurisdiction over this question—that it had not the time to attend to it. So, after consulting with several people—I could not consult with everybody—I introduced this resolution for the purpose of appointing a committee whose sole business it shall be to investigate from the best sources of information attainable to see if it is possible to prevent this destruction of property and life by curtailing the overflows of the rivers. It so happened that last year was an extraordinarily rainy year in the Mississippi Valley. It rained 12 or 15 inches more between Pittsburgh and the dry belt in the extreme West than usual. These floods were extraordinary; but at this very minute a great flood is working vast destruction.

I will confess that I do not know whether it is possible to control these floods at all; but from the way we have been going I know that we would never find out whether it was possible or not. The only thing to do, it seems to me, is to appoint a committee that will take the best advice it can get, see if a system can be devised to curtail, if that is the word, the vast amount of water that goes down the rivers, overflowing the whole country, and make them go down more gradually.

The truth is that what tends to make these great floods more than anything else is that the whole country is nearly denuded of trees and foliage. The water which took when we were boys, or before we were born, two weeks to seep into the streams runs down the furrows into the streams now in 24 or 48 hours. Something has got to be done about it.

In the meantime, if they can devise a scheme that will meet the indorsement of Congress and the country, make suggestions as to how to drain the overflowed land, they ought to do that. There has been some controversy here to-day about what jurisdiction this committee will have. If the resolution passes, as soon as the committee is organized I am going to refer to that committee all the bills having reference to the question of drainage and overflow, and that committee will have enough to do. And remember the proposed new committee can not report appropriations—not a penny. I am in favor of constituting the committee. I have no personal interest in it except that I happen to live in a district that is bordered on one side by the Mississippi, split wide open by the Missouri, and has in it four other rivers, navigable by act of Congress, and in no other way. [Laughter and applause.]

The SPEAKER. The previous question having been ordered, the question now is on the adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

#### INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of further considering the bill 10385, the Indian appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. FOSTER in the chair.



The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10385, the Indian appropriation bill, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For commencing the construction of a dam with bridge superstructure and necessary controlling works for diverting water from the Gila River for the irrigation of Indian land and allotments on the Gila River Indian Reservation, Ariz., as recommended by the Board of Engineers of the United States Army in paragraph 217 of its report to the Secretary of War of February 14, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 791), \$75,000, to remain available until expended, reimbursable under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, the total cost not to exceed \$200,000.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that paragraph.

Mr. HAYDEN. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. BORLAND. I will reserve the point of order if the gentleman wants to make a speech.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the gentleman will read the hearings before the committee, he will find that this appropriation is amply justified. The department asked for an appropriation of \$200,000 for this purpose, but the committee thought best to advance but \$75,000 at this time, limiting the total cost of the project to \$200,000. The United States has already constructed at great expense a canal on the north side of the Gila River which irrigates 10,000 acres of Indian land. There is a similar canal on the south side, but the Indians do not get the full benefit of these canals, although they have tried to do the best they can with brush diversion dams. This appropriation is justified by the report of a board of Army engineers appointed by direction of the Congress to look into this matter. I would like to know on what grounds the gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order, and if he has any justification for his attitude in the matter.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, this work here is estimated to cost \$200,000, but so far as I know that is a very small estimate and probably an underestimate. There is no doubt, Mr. Chairman, but what it is new legislation subject to a point of order. Now, as to the justification, I might say this about it. As I understand, the Gila River carries very little water anyway, and all the irrigation that is possible is by diverting the flood water.

It is possible to occasionally divert water from the floods of the Gila River, but unless there are built storage works on the Gila River near the headwaters of the river there is no permanent source of water in the Gila River. The project has been fully considered several times by the Reclamation Commission and has been universally condemned by them as a business proposition. It is feasible from an engineering standpoint, because the Army engineers say so, but I doubt very much whether they can limit the cost to \$200,000 or whether it would be feasible even at that. This proposition, as I understand it, contemplates only a diversion canal. That could not store any water.

Mr. HAYDEN. It does not contemplate the storage of any water.

Mr. BORLAND. And there is no water available there for constant irrigation without some storage works.

Mr. HAYDEN. The gentleman will remember that when he visited the Salt River project he saw the diversion dam at Granite Reef, and that it cost very much less than the reservoir.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. And if the farmers in the Salt River Valley to-day were compelled either to do without the Roosevelt Reservoir and maintain the Granite Reef Dam or have the reservoir and do without a permanent diversion dam, they would prefer to do without the reservoir. The people in all countries where they get water from torrential streams lose more by floods than they do by droughts. I was born under a canal system where we irrigate about 20,000 acres, and formerly we built little brush dams just as the Pima Indians do. A flood would come along and wash the dam out, and before we could repair it the flood had passed, so that there was no water for irrigation. Now we have a permanent diversion dam and we get the benefit of every flood that comes. That is what these Indians can do, and it is absolutely necessary that such a permanent diversion dam be constructed in order to properly cultivate their lands on the Pima Reservation.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman knows as well as I do that in that country a diversion dam without storage works is practically ineffective.

Mr. HAYDEN. On the contrary, such a dam is of immense benefit.

Mr. BORLAND. The whole proposition has been on the Gila River to create storage works, and that particular storage-works proposition has been an alternative proposition with the

Salt. When the Salt River was adopted it was because it was considered a better proposition than the Gila. In other words, the Gila was condemned.

Mr. HAYDEN. This appropriation is justified on its own merits, whether any storage works are ever built on the Gila River or not.

Mr. BORLAND. I want to say further to the gentleman that irrigation has not proceeded very rapidly for the white settlers. That is, the white settlers have not been able to avail themselves, even under favorable conditions, of the advantages of irrigation, but it has not proceeded rapidly at all for the Indians. In the Blackfeet Reservation they have spent nearly a million dollars of money, which is supposed to be reimbursable—though whether it will be or not I do not know—on that Two Medicine Lake diversion dam and storage works for the Blackfeet Indians. About 26,000 acres can be furnished with water. It was originally calculated at 40,000 acres. Out of those 26,000 acres last year 600 were cultivated, and this year it is said that perhaps a thousand acres will be cultivated. In other words, it has cost the Indians, if they pay for it, \$900 an acre for storage works, and that does not take into consideration the maintenance of those works, and if you assess the maintenance of those works against the Indians, even while bringing them under cultivation, you would find that the cost was so prohibitive that the Indians would not do it.

Mr. HAYDEN. The difference between an Indian irrigation project in Montana and one in Arizona is this: When the first Spaniards came into Arizona they found the Pima Indians watering their crops. They are familiar with irrigation and know what to do with any irrigation works that may be provided for them. You take a blanket Indian, accustomed to hunting on the prairies, bring him onto a reservation, and although you may give him the benefit of the very best irrigation works, yet he does not know how to take advantage of water for irrigation. You will find that the Pimas in all their history have made beneficial use of all the water that they could get. They have been deprived of their water by appropriations farther up the stream, but they will use this diversion dam and use it well. If the gentleman will take the trouble to read the hearings, he will find that all the money heretofore spent on the Pimas for irrigation has been profitably expended.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I have read the hearings, and they were very much less in their scope than the hearings we have already had on that same subject. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the hearings we have had on this very same subject when we had this proposition under consideration last year, and I want to say in this connection that the next item following is the same proposition, so that what I will read applies to both of them.

This is in relation to the San Carlos project, and I read from the hearings of last year:

Mr. BORLAND. You are also being importuned to start a project at San Carlos on the Gila?

Mr. NEWELL. That is a matter before Congress. I have been in former years enthusiastic about it, but as the years have gone by I have become less and less so. The last examination was ordered by Congress and was put into the hands of the Army engineers, rather than into our hands, it being thought possibly we were not as optimistic as we might be.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that Mr. Newell has reported in favor of that?

Mr. BORLAND. He says so, and he says that further experience convinced him. He says:

The report of that board is extremely interesting. It shows that on the basis of the water supply that we are furnishing to the Salt River Valley it will cost, I think, nearly \$144 an acre. But they propose to furnish only 2 acre-feet per acre at the land, while we furnish at the head of the canal 4.5 acre-feet, based on many years of experience. If they furnish as much water as we do, it will cut the project down, I think, to about 44,000 acres, barely enough for the area on the Indian reservation.

He says this will not furnish over 2 acre-feet, and that it will require  $4\frac{1}{2}$  acre-feet per man:

Mr. BORLAND. So the report has been rather unfavorable to the Government carrying on the San Carlos project?

Mr. NEWELL. I would not say unfavorable; it has simply pointed out the difficulty, and that we should not go into the San Carlos project expecting to get as good a supply as we have on the Salt River project at the same price.

And further down:

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Newell, in addition to the very considerable cost, or estimated cost, per acre of the irrigation of the lands on the Gila, I recall that former examinations there developed the fact, or was said to have developed the fact, that the Gila carries enormous quantities of silt, and that any storage reservoir built would fill up with silt in a few years. And the later examinations bore out those former statements or former expressions of opinion relative to the silt.

Mr. NEWELL. In general they have. The accumulation of silt is a most serious problem. The Board of Army Engineers in reporting upon

It recommended that after a certain number of years works should be built or devices installed for getting rid of the silt—

And so forth.

Mr. BORLAND. So that you see that the cost of such a work will—

Mr. HAYDEN. The gentleman will be fair enough to the House to state that what he has read relates only to storage works?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. What I am talking about is a diversion dam, a totally separate and distinct matter, and which stands on its own merits and has nothing to do with the San Carlos project.

Mr. BORLAND. I think the gentleman will agree with the experience of this House, that if we spend \$75,000 or \$200,000 in starting some diversion works there, the next step will be storage works, because complaint will be made, and based upon good evidence, that the particular works we have built are not available until they get some storage. When they get the storage, then they will do the same way, and say they will not be available until some method is provided for relieving the river of silt. In other words, the estimate is not anywhere near complete.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have offered this amendment in good faith, and I believe that the works can be constructed within the amount stated. The two diversion dams stand on their merits and have nothing whatever to do with the construction of a reservoir at San Carlos.

Mr. BORLAND. I insist it is hardly a beginning of what is going to be a great big project, a project of perhaps \$6,000,000.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. If the gentleman will permit a suggestion, the object of these diversion dams is the same as every other diversion dam at various points in the West. I have in mind the Rio Grande. It is to stop the underflow underneath the sand and silt, so that these diversion dams will hold water that will be turned loose through the ditches on the farms below, whereas if there is no diversion dam it will sink underneath the sand, and every man who lives in the West knows that under the quicksand of these broad rivers in the West, this one especially, you can dig down 1 or 2 feet and get plenty of water, and then if you can stop the underflow from escaping you can impound it. That is why these diversion dams are built down to hardpan, either clay or something impervious to water, so it can not seep through.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. I make the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will reserve the point of order if he intends to make it.

Mr. BORLAND. If possible, I will reserve it.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I agree very largely with what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] has said. I think, however, that what he said applies to the following item rather than to this item. I am of the opinion that it would not be wise to adopt the following item without further consideration of the matter by Congress, because the item is clearly a feature of a great project on the Gila, which would cost, as the gentleman from Missouri suggests, at least \$6,000,000. But the item now under discussion is not necessarily a part of that general project. I think there is objection to the language of the paragraph which says, "as recommended by the Board of Army Engineers." As a matter of fact, the Board of Army Engineers did not, as I recall, recommend a diversion dam at this point.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the gentleman will pardon me, in the finding of the board, page 65 of the report, to the Secretary of War—

(d) That in case the project is not undertaken until after an adjudication, a diversion dam on the reservation be constructed to improve irrigation conditions on the Pima Reservation.

In other words, whether the reservoir is constructed or not, this diversion dam ought to be built immediately.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MONDELL. In a moment. That particular suggestion of the Board of Engineers had escaped me. What I had in mind was that the diversion dam which was proposed by the Board of Engineers was not a diversion dam at this point, but at an entirely different point. What I started to say was this: The Board of Army Engineers did not, as a matter of fact, recommend this project at all, except under certain conditions, to wit, if on investigation it was discovered that there was a sufficient water supply available, if it was discovered that certain conditions might be met as to the acre cost.

Quite a number of "ifs" in the recommendations of the board, but none of those "ifs," so far as I know, have been met.

Mr. HAYDEN. All of those "ifs" were as to the construction of the storage reservoir; but there are no "ifs and ands"

about the construction of this diversion dam, as recommended by the Army board.

Mr. MONDELL. I agree with the gentleman from Arizona, that while this is expensive work for what it would probably accomplish, it would, in the first place, give the people a good bridge at this point, and that, in my opinion, is a meritorious feature of the proposition.

Mr. HAYDEN. I will be perfectly willing to see the bridge feature stricken out rather than see the whole appropriation fail.

Mr. MONDELL. I think the gentleman ought to leave the bridge feature in it. I think it is an important one, and it does not greatly increase the cost of the structure very much. The structure would make available, more than at the present time, the waters of the Gila River for irrigation through the ditch that was made by the Reclamation Service.

Mr. BORLAND. Now, the gentleman is more familiar technically and practically with irrigation than any man in this House. As I understand from the hearings on this particular item, they now have a ditch there?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. Which is intended to divert the flood waters of the Gila, or whatever water there is in the Gila, and that ditch has not been sufficient, because there is no water in the Gila at the irrigating season of the year. Would this dam supply water for that ditch throughout the irrigating season of the year?

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman from Missouri had read the hearings in the matter—

Mr. BORLAND. I did read them.

Mr. MONDELL. I mean the hearings before the Committee on Indian Affairs—

Mr. BORLAND. I did so.

Mr. MONDELL. He would recall that the lock diversion dam at the intake of the ditch of the Reclamation Service—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I am withholding my point of order for that purpose.

Mr. MONDELL. As I said, he would recall the fact that the lack of a diversion dam at that point rendered the ditch that had been built for the Reclamation Service of comparatively little value. That is the situation, as I understand it.

Mr. HAYDEN. The gentleman from Wyoming states what is exactly true.

Mr. MONDELL. And this diversion dam would at least do this. That it is going to be beneficial there can be no question, because, first, it will make that ditch heretofore built by the Government available so far as there is water in the river. It will make it available much later in the season than it is now, and it will prevent the heading being constantly and annually washed out; second, it will make possible the building of a ditch on the other side, if that is advisable, for the use of water on the other side of the river, and undoubtedly it will add very much to the value of what they already have there in the way of development. In addition to that, I am still inclined to think that the bridge feature of it is one that should not be overlooked, because there is an enormous stretch of country that would be benefited.

Mr. BORLAND. It is clear from what the gentleman says that the whole plan is problematic. Its benefit to the Indians is entirely problematic and has not been worked out by these engineers, who are specially charged with it.

Mr. MONDELL. But what I want to emphasize is this: That this work will be of a very considerable benefit. It will make useful a project we already have, and this particular work does not in any way necessarily involve entering upon the large project.

Mr. BORLAND. I think the gentleman will agree with me that we have entered hastily into these irrigation projects in the hope that they would do some good, and in many cases we have been disappointed. And this is particularly true with these Indian projects, because we always hear that the amounts spent are reimbursable from the Indians, and if they do not do any good the Indians will have to pay for them anyway. But that is not always the case. I think if we have a scientific body especially charged with that kind of work of irrigation we ought to defer to their opinion about the practicability of these works and not go into the matter simply because of the hope that they may do some good.

Mr. HAYDEN. This matter has been investigated by two different authorities: First, by a board of Army engineers, who were on the ground and spent \$25,000 in making the investigation; and, second, by the engineers of the Indian Service, who



have been on the ground and have drawn plans and specifications for the dam and bridge and estimated the cost. I can not see why the gentleman continues to talk about a storage reservoir and says nothing about this diversion dam.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Davis says:

Yes, sir. I wish to say, though, that I do not agree with that report and never did.

Mr. BORLAND. You did not agree with that report?

Mr. A. P. DAVIS. No, sir; it was issued before I came back from Nicaragua.

Mr. BORLAND. What discrepancy did you find in that report?

Mr. A. P. DAVIS. I thought the area to be irrigated was overestimated and the cost was greatly underestimated.

That is the same man who is still in charge of the Reclamation Service. Mr. Newell was the former chief, and this is the present chief.

Mr. MONDELL. Let me call my friend's attention to the fact, as the gentleman from Arizona is attempting to do, that what he is discussing is not the proposition we have now before us.

Mr. BORLAND. I think I understand he is not discussing the San Carlos Dam or the proposition at Florence, but he is discussing simply this diversion dam to divert water for the Pima Indians. That is a part of this general plan, which, in general, has been condemned. The only question is whether—and it is a very serious question—this \$200,000 dam can be built and the land can respond to its cost as a single proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has expired. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] make the point of order?

Mr. BORLAND. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I think the point of order is well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For beginning the construction by the Indian Service of a dam and necessary controlling works for diverting water from the Gila River at a site above Florence, Ariz., for the irrigation of Indian lands on the Gila River Indian Reservation and private and public lands in Pinal County, Ariz., as estimated by the Board of Engineer Officers of the United States Army in paragraph 138 of its report to the Secretary of War of February 14, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 791), \$75,000, to remain available until expended, the total cost not to exceed \$175,000: *Provided*, That the water diverted from the Gila River by said dam shall be distributed by the Secretary of the Interior to the Indian lands of said reservation and to the private and public lands in said county in accordance with the respective rights and priorities of such lands to the beneficial use of said water as may be determined by a court of competent jurisdiction: *Provided further*, That the construction charge for the actual cost of said dam and other works shall be divided pro rata by the Secretary of the Interior between the Indian lands and the public and private lands in said county in accordance with the area of land entitled to water, as decreed by said court; and said charge as fixed for said Indian lands shall be reimbursable as provided in section 2 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. L., p. 522); but the construction charge as fixed for the public and private lands in said county shall be paid by the owner or entryman in accordance with the terms of an act extending the period of payment under reclamation projects, approved August 13, 1914.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold his point of order for a moment?

Mr. BORLAND. I will, long enough to give the gentleman a chance to make a statement about it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation for the construction of a diversion dam on the Gila River above Florence has been approved by the Secretary of the Interior in a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, which is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
Washington, January 21, 1916.

MY DEAR MR. STEPHENS: Further consideration has been given the draft of an amendment intended to be made to the Indian appropriation bill, for the construction of a dam across the Gila River above Florence, Ariz., referred with your letter of December 24, 1915, requesting the views of this department thereon.

The proposed work meets the approval of this department. The provisions under which the money is to be expended relating to the control of the works, the water to be diverted thereby, and the reimbursement to the United States thereof by the owners of lands irrigable thereunder, seem to provide satisfactorily for the management and financing of the project. In order that there may be no question of the supervision of the construction of this dam, it is recommended that the words "by the Indian Service" be inserted in line 1, after the word "construction."

The amount proposed to be appropriated is \$100,000, which is only part of the total cost of \$175,000. For a structure of this kind it is believed that serious risk would be run in attempting to build only part of it, owing to the danger from floods and the shifting channels of the Gila River. It is therefore recommended that the amount to be appropriated be increased to \$175,000, and that the item be amended by striking out the figures "\$175,000" and substituting therefor the words "said sum" (line 13). This change would make it necessary to strike out the word "beginning" in the first line.

The second page of the proposed amendment contains a reference to the act of August 24, 1914, as the act under which reimbursement by the Indians of their proportionate cost of the project is to be made.

This is apparently a typographical error, as no doubt the act of August 24, 1912, is intended.

A similar item which was included in the bill H. R. 20150, Sixty-third Congress, second session, was the subject of my report of January 28, 1915, a copy of which is inclosed and which has been printed in the hearings before the Committee on Indian Affairs of the United States Senate, volume 1, page 498 et seq.

In addition to the information therein exhibited, the proposed work will benefit a large number of Indians on the Gila River Reservation, approximately 3,000, by providing under existing conditions for the diversion of water to irrigate an area of over 20,000 acres of fine agricultural land on the reservation. With storage provided, the area of land would be limited only by the available water supply.

Cordially, yours,

FRANKLIN K. LANE, Secretary.

Hon. JOHN H. STEPHENS,

Chairman Committee on Indian Affairs, House of Representatives.

A similar item was included in the Indian appropriation bill in the Senate last year. That bill failed to become a law owing to the filibuster at the close of the session. In his report made at that time the Secretary of the Interior said:

JANUARY 28, 1915.

MY DEAR SENATOR ASHURST: I have received your communication of January 19, 1915, requesting report upon a proposed amendment to the Indian bill making an appropriation of \$75,000 for beginning the construction of a dam and necessary controlling works for diverting water from the Gila River at a site above Florence, Ariz., for the irrigation of Indian land and allotments on the Gila River Indian Reservation and private lands in Pinal County, as estimated by the Board of Engineer Officers of the United States Army in its report to the Secretary of War, page 46, paragraphs 138-138 (H. Doc. 791, 63d Cong., 2d sess.).

This report describes the situation with regard to the diversion dam which it will be necessary to construct in order to utilize the waters of the Gila River when the San Carlos Dam is built. However, the usefulness of this diversion dam does not depend entirely upon the construction of the San Carlos Reservoir, because for many years past considerable areas of land have been irrigated by diversion through various headings of the flood flow of the Gila River above Florence. To irrigate the lands of the Pima Indian Reservation upon the south side of the Gila River at the upper or eastern end of the reservation will require the construction of such a dam in order to conserve the flow of the river to as great an extent as possible. The proposed site, about 12 miles above Florence, is at the mouth of a series of canyons through which the river flows uninterruptedly from San Carlos, but from this point on the river course is through a broad flat valley, with an immense river bed, consisting of broad deep deposits of silt and gravel. When the flow of the river is low, and when, of course, water is most valuable, the stream disappears entirely soon after emerging from the mountains above Florence.

Aside from the use which the Indian reservation may eventually make of this diversion dam, practically all of the landowners off the reservation who have been irrigating in this vicinity may receive their supply of flood water from this point of diversion.

The Gila River has just experienced one of the most disastrous floods in its history, and all the headings of the various canals above Florence have been washed away, and the earth covering through which these canals ran has been entirely removed, so that these channels can not be again constructed. The superintendent of the reservation reports also that at least one canal heading for the Indian reservation, on the south side of the river, is washed out, and the large canal, known as the Little Gila, has been very badly damaged. The land which this canal supplies with water could be reached from channels heading at the diversion dam which it is proposed to build, and when so supplied would be past all danger of future damage or destruction.

The white owners who have suffered by the recent floods might possibly secure means of constructing a dam at the point mentioned, thus insuring to themselves immunity from a recurring flood, but it might be necessary for the Government to oppose such a step in order to protect the water right now claimed for the Indians.

While there is no doubt but that, as a matter of law, the Pima Indians have a prior right to the waters of the Gila River as against all other appropriators on that stream, yet they have not been receiving a sufficient quantity of water to irrigate their lands for lack of the physical means of obtaining the same. The construction of a diversion dam at this point will give the Indians an advantage of location that they have not heretofore enjoyed, because the Government of the United States will thus actually control the only feasible point where the waters of the Gila may be diverted. The Indians are entitled to control this strategic position in order to adequately preserve and perpetuate the Government's claim to water in their behalf, and for this reason alone, whether the San Carlos Reservoir is ever constructed or not, this appropriation is amply justified.

The cost of the diversion dam itself is estimated by the board of Army engineers as \$150,000, and an additional item of \$25,000 should be included in order to make the necessary excavation through the rock heading, so that connection may be made with the present canal systems of the Florence district. The site of the proposed diversion is an ideal one compared with others along the Gila River, as on both sides of the river are massive outcroppings of rock. The river bed is comparatively narrow and confined between hills to this one channel, and a railroad upon which to bring in supplies and materials parallels the river at this point, so that the cost would be the minimum for such work. The railroad track is high enough above the river so that no interference with its operation will result even after the dam is built. The dam will not be high enough for storage purposes, but simply a low weir a few feet above the normal surface of the river, so that water may be properly diverted into the canal, and that all of the flow at the low stages, when the water is most valuable, and which occur for long periods, may be available.

It is recommended that the proposed amendment receive favorable consideration by Congress.

Cordially, yours,

FRANKLIN K. LANE,

Hon. H. F. ASHURST,

Chairman Committee on Indian Affairs, United States Senate.

That a diversion dam can be constructed for the amount named in this bill is shown by the report of the Board of Engineer officers of the Army, three paragraphs of which discuss this subject:

136. At the several sites for a diversion dam ledge rock is found at one or both abutments, but investigation has shown that toward the

center of the river rock is not within practicable reach. However, for the lift desired, not to exceed 10 feet, a dam of the Indian type will answer.

137. Through the courtesy of Mr. G. S. Binkley, member of the American Society of Civil Engineers, the board has been able to consult the design for a diversion dam for this place prepared by the late Mr. J. D. Schuyler in 1911 and a later design prepared by Messrs. Schuyler and Binkley.

138. From a consideration of these designs and the quantities of materials required for a dam following the second design the board is able to state that the cost of the diversion dam, including head gate and silt sluice, need not exceed \$150,000.

Worse floods than the high water in the Gila mentioned in the original report of the Secretary of the Interior have recently occurred, as is shown by this telegram which I have received from Mr. F. H. Thackery, the superintendent at Sacaton:

SACATON VIA CASA GRANDE, ARIZ., February 3, 1916.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,

House of Representatives, Washington D. C.:

Recent flood damage to Indian lands and canals is more than \$100,000 on Pima Reservation. Immediate relief urgent.

THACKERY, Superintendent.

I have also received three other telegrams which will give the House an idea of the necessity for this appropriation:

FLORENCE, ARIZ., February 3, 1916.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN, M. C.,

Washington:

Recent flood of Gila River damaged various canals and heads and other properties of white settlers to amount of \$40,000. Have conferred with Thackery, superintendent Pima Indian Reservation, and he estimates their damage sustained by same flood as not less than \$100,000.

E. W. COKER.

CASA GRANDE, ARIZ., February 2, 1916.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN, M. C.,

Washington, D. C.:

Conditions here serious. Demand prompt attention to avoid great suffering. Canals badly broken. Head gates and dams all washed out. Much other damage done by recent floods. Three thousand Indians and large number of white settlers dependent on waters of Gila River to mature crops. Unless something is done immediately will be left in destitute circumstances. Appropriation should be made and work started on diversion dam above Florence at once. Such dam would solve problem and be salvation of country.

J. F. BROWN.

CASA GRANDE, ARIZ., February 2, 1916.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Chamber of Commerce of Casa Grande, Ariz., urges passage of your amendment in Indian appropriation bill for diversion dam on Gila River above Florence. Absolutely necessary to enable Indians, settlers, and farmers to save crops. Situation most critical. Temporary dams out by recent floods. Much suffering unless Congress gives relief. Wire result.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,  
A. A. JAYNE, President.

This calamity which has fallen on the white settlers and Indians alike has forced everybody to recognize that they have a community of interest in the waters of the Gila, and that the only way that these flood waters can be put to a beneficial use is by the construction of a reinforced concrete diversion dam by the Government. These same waters that now spread destruction along the valley of the Gila can thus be controlled and made to serve the irrigators, both red and white, who are most anxious for this relief. The Indians and the white men must live together in this valley for all time to come. They have suffered alike from floods and from drought, and I want to see them prosper together in equal measure, as I know they will if Congress appropriates the money for this diversion dam above Florence.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, this is the larger project that the gentleman was speaking about. When the reclamation law was first passed, one of the projects that was then being considered by the Geological Survey, which had a good deal of influence on passing the bill, was the storage works on the Gila River, but after the law was passed private interests in the Salt River Valley were so much more influential and powerful that they succeeded in killing the Gila River project and in substituting for it the Roosevelt Dam on the Salt River, on which we have expended \$11,000,000. It was thought by some Members at that time that we were making a mistake with respect to the relative advantages of the two projects; that we ought to have gone on with the Gila River project and not undertaken the Salt River project. But in their anxiety to kill the Gila River project, the Salt River interest did it effectually, and they secured various engineer's reports showing that the Gila project was impracticable. The great objection was that a dam on the Gila would fill up with silt in a short time. We asked them during the hearings, "If a dam silts up, what will you do?" and they answered that in India, where such projects were carried on, when a dam silts up they let it go and proceed to build another dam. You will find that given in the testimony.

I am talking about the general project, and I admit that, as a pure business proposition in all these southwestern streams, like

the Gila River and the Salt River, storage works are the essential features. I do not think it would be two sessions of Congress, or maybe one, after action was had here before local interests would be here again asking for storage works. The Government might invest \$400,000 in these two projects, and then it would be argued that it would be a moral crime not to give the people water, and the only way to do that would be to put in storage works.

The local interests secured the Salt River project, and now, on the Indian bill, they are trying to put in the Gila project also, before a dollar has been returned to the Reclamation Service for the construction charges on the other project, although the Salt River Valley is eminently prosperous, as I think the gentleman will admit, and is one of the most beautiful valleys in the world and full of active and energetic and prosperous people.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am coming here asking this Congress for an appropriation for this project on its own merits, it having nothing to do with the construction of the San Carlos Reservoir. Regardless of whether the San Carlos Reservoir is ever constructed or not, this appropriation is amply justified.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona asks unguisous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] makes a point of order on the paragraph. Unless gentlemen wish to be heard further on the point of order, the Chair will rule. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to furnish in perpetuity for the irrigation of 631 Salt River Indian allotments of 10 acres each, to be designated by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, water from works constructed under the provision of the reclamation act, and acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto: *Provided*, That the reclamation fund shall be reimbursed therefor upon terms the same as those provided in said act or acts for reimbursement by entrymen on lands irrigated by said works, and there is hereby appropriated \$20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay the initial installment of the charges when made for said water.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. It may be lack of knowledge or intelligence, but I can not tell from the reading of this paragraph whether this water is to be furnished without the Indians making a contribution for the maintenance charges or not.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Indians take the water out of the main canal and handle it themselves, so there is no charge for maintenance.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has not answered my suggestion at all. The bill says, "The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to furnish in perpetuity," and so forth. That directs him to furnish it. Are they to pay for the maintenance charges of it?

Mr. BORLAND. I think the law already covers that.

Mr. MANN. The law could not cover it, because this is new law.

Mr. BORLAND. The law under which it was begun, as I recollect, provided that the Indians were to contribute a certain amount toward that Salt River project, and they were to have a certain amount of water. What they really got was some wells and a transmission line for power. They were not satisfied with that. Now, it is proposed to give them the water. The original act provided that their lands should be assessed, the same as those of the white settlers.

Mr. HAYDEN. This act says that the Indians shall receive water on an additional area of land within their reservation.

Mr. MANN. What act says that?

Mr. HAYDEN. This section here. The Secretary of the Interior shall furnish water for 6,310 acres of land.

Mr. MANN. Then it provides that the reclamation fund shall be reimbursed therefor on the terms provided in a certain act. If we make an appropriation for maintenance charges, I take it that under the terms of this provision we will make an appropriation every year, probably in perpetuity, for those maintenance charges.

Mr. HAYDEN. Congress will be required to make an appropriation every year for the construction and maintenance charges. Instead of making an appropriation for the whole amount of \$65 an acre for 6,310 acres, we will appropriate the amount that probably will be due next year and so on thereafter.



Mr. MANN. Will the Indian allottees pay their proportionate share of the maintenance charges of this project?

Mr. HAYDEN. They will have to, unless Congress appropriates the money.

Mr. MANN. Suppose they do not do it?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Indians will not get any water until somebody pays for it.

Mr. MANN. The Secretary of the Interior is empowered to furnish in perpetuity this water, whether they pay anything for it or not.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. NORTON. This appropriation here is for the purpose of purchasing the water right. The water right is worth \$65 an acre. That does not pay for the charge each year for water, for the operating expenses, but it pays for the construction charges of the project.

Mr. MANN. I will ask the gentleman from North Dakota the simple, easy, plain question that I have asked already and that no gentleman has answered.

Mr. NORTON. I will answer it.

Mr. MANN. Will these Indian allottees, under this provision, pay their proportion of the maintenance charges of this project?

Mr. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is sure of that?

Mr. NORTON. Outside of—

Mr. MANN. Oh, not outside of anything.

Mr. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman says he is sure about that, I will withdraw the point of order, but I do not want to get fooled on it. I want somebody who knows to answer it. The gentlemen over there on the other side will not answer.

Mr. MONDELL. May I suggest—

Mr. MANN. No; I want somebody on the committee, who is responsible for the item, to make the statement.

Mr. NORTON. I will say to the gentleman that it is not contemplated that out of this item the maintenance charges will be paid; and I will say to the gentleman that I do not know whether they will be paid by the Indian Bureau out of some other fund for the Indians; but I can answer the gentleman as to this item.

Mr. MANN. I am going to hold the gentleman to his first statement. I did not ask anything about the appropriation in this item. Here is a provision directing the Secretary of the Interior to furnish water in perpetuity. He has to do it or he is subject to impeachment, whether they pay anything or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Then I will expire also, and will withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. I renew the point of order, or reserve it, rather.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield to me for a suggestion?

Mr. MONDELL. I was going to say to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] that I do not intend to make the point of order, provided we can amend this paragraph—

Mr. BORLAND. Suppose we strike out all after the word "works," in line 10.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not intend to make the point of order, if we can amend this paragraph so as to make it very clear what we are trying to do.

Mr. BORLAND. Why not strike out all after the word "works," in line 10, page 19, simply providing that the reclamation fund shall be reimbursed upon terms the same as those provided for reimbursement by entrymen, and so forth, and stop there?

Mr. MONDELL. That would strike out this first appropriation.

Mr. BORLAND. That would strike out the first appropriation.

Mr. MONDELL. We do not want to do that.

Mr. BORLAND. That would leave the lands clearly subject to maintenance charges.

Mr. MONDELL. I think an amendment there might be in order; but what I had in mind was to meet the suggestion made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. The language of the section is that the Secretary is authorized and directed to furnish water in perpetuity. Well, that language could only be used properly if in some way or other the Secretary of the Interior as an official had some water rights or some water which he in perpetuity could continue to furnish. What you intend to do is to provide perpetual water rights. That can be done

by striking out the word "furnish" and inserting the words "provide for water rights."

The section would then read that the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to provide for water rights in perpetuity for the irrigation of these lands from the reclamation project.

Mr. HAYDEN. I did not write this section, and I think the amendment suggested by the gentleman is a good one.

Mr. MONDELL. With that language there would be no question but what these lands would be subject to the construction charge, and they would be on the same basis as other lands in regard to charges for maintenance; and if that amendment were adopted, I think the objection, which was a very pertinent one, made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] would be met. On page 19, line 2, I would strike out the word "furnish" and insert the words "provide for water rights."

Mr. Chairman, if I may offer an amendment with a point of order pending—

Mr. BORLAND. I will renew the point of order, but I will yield to the gentleman to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming can not offer an amendment while the point of order is pending.

Mr. MONDELL. I take it that the gentleman from Arizona has no objection.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. I think the item is a very proper one, and I think all those who are familiar with the situation there realize the necessity for some provision whereby these lands which lie under the Salt River project can be irrigated from that project. I want to ask the gentleman from Arizona what his knowledge or information is as to the extent to which these lands have at this time been provided with ditches and laterals. In other words, I would like to know whether this item will necessitate any considerable expenditure by the Reclamation Service.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Indians are irrigating 65,000 or 75,000 acres of land at no expense to the Reclamation Service or anybody else for laterals. They have built their own laterals and they can build such additional ones as are necessary. I do not believe that they will require any aid from the Reclamation Service.

Mr. MONDELL. I am quite certain that the service did build some of these laterals. These lands are many miles from the lands that the gentleman from Missouri has in mind. They are just below where the big canal on the north side takes out of the Salt River. The gentleman will recall that he saw some of these lands from above as a party of which he was a member went over the embankment of the big ditch last summer. I am under the impression there have been some canals built over these lands by the Reclamation Service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

[By unanimous consent, Mr. MONDELL was given five minutes more.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I think the item should remain in, but if it does it is important that we should know whether it will require additional appropriation for that project.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The Indians are undertaking to cultivate 7,000 acres of this land, and the water is insufficient. The \$20,000 would be quite an advantage in supplying them with the water that they do not now have. I think it is very necessary unless you desire to cripple the whole irrigation project. There is not a finer body of land or a richer body of land or one more available to the reservation than this is.

Mr. BORLAND. Let me ask the gentleman, Is this \$20,000 reimbursable?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Yes; the item provides:

That the reclamation fund shall be reimbursed therefor upon terms the same as those provided in said act or acts for reimbursement by entrymen on lands irrigated by said works, and there is hereby appropriated \$20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay the initial installment of the charges when made for said water.

Mr. BORLAND. Do these Indians have any tribal funds?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. No; but they have some very valuable land.

Mr. BORLAND. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, against the paragraph; and then I will offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, insert at the head of the page, the following:

"That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to furnish in perpetuity for the irrigation of 631 Salt River Indian allotments of 10 acres each, to be designated by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, water from works constructed under the provision of the reclamation act, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto: *Provided*, That the reclamation fund shall be reimbursed

therefor upon terms the same as those provided in said act or acts for reimbursement by entrymen on lands irrigated by said works."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. BORLAND. It seems to me there can be no objection to that.

Mr. HAYDEN. It seems to me that that amendment is useless. The Indians have no money and they can not pay for it. If you say they shall get something and you do not appropriate the money for it, it is useless to them.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman from Arizona withhold his point of order? I make the suggestion to the gentleman that he allow the amendment to be considered in order, then it is permissible for him to offer an amendment carrying an appropriation. He will only be spiting himself by making the point of order.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the amendment by striking out in the second line the word "furnish" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "provide for water rights."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, amend the amendment in line 2 by striking out the word "furnish" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "provide for water rights."

Mr. HAYDEN. That is all right.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. We accept that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming to the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to add at the end of the amendment the words "and there is hereby appropriated \$20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay the initial charges when made for said water."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by adding, at the end of the amendment, the words "and there is hereby appropriated \$20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay the initial charges when made for said water."

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the amendment by striking out the figures "\$20,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "\$25,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming would not be in order. It is an amendment in the third degree. There is an amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] and also an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri as amended.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri by striking out "\$20,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$25,000."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. That would not be in order, as it would be striking out something which the committee has already agreed to. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the construction of a bridge across the Little Colorado River, at or near the town of Winslow, Ariz., \$15,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be expended until the Secretary of the Interior shall have obtained from the proper authorities of the State of Arizona, or the county of Navajo, satisfactory guarantees of the payment by the said State of Arizona, or by the county of Navajo, of at least one-half of the cost of said bridge, and that the proper authorities of the said State of Arizona, or the said county of Navajo, shall assume full responsibility for, and will at all times maintain and repair, said bridge and the approaches thereto: *And provided further*, That any and all expenses above the amount herein named in connection with the building and maintaining of said bridge shall be borne either by the said State of Arizona or the said county of Navajo.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. For whose benefit is this bridge to be constructed?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Navajo Indians.

Mr. MANN. They have a large fund out there, have they not?

Mr. HAYDEN. They have no tribal funds at all. They have about 9,000,000 acres of land in their reservation.

Mr. MANN. That is "a large fund out there." Why should they not pay for this bridge?

Mr. HAYDEN. It was a mistake that there was not language included in that paragraph providing that the cost of the bridge should be reimbursable, and I should be glad to accept any amendment the gentleman may suggest.

Mr. MANN. I have not prepared an amendment, but I am perfectly willing to let it go over and have the gentleman prepare an amendment.

Mr. BORLAND. I make the point of order, if the gentleman from Illinois withdraws it.

Mr. MANN. I reserve the point of order. The gentleman can make use of that at any time.

Mr. BORLAND. I thought the gentleman was about to withdraw it.

Mr. MANN. No; but I am perfectly willing to have it go over, with the point of order pending, until the gentleman prepares an amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest an amendment, after the word "interior," by inserting the words "and to be reimbursable from any funds now or hereafter placed in the Treasury to the credit of said Indians." That is the language that we have been using right along.

Mr. MANN. I am willing to accept that, and will withdraw the point of order.

Mr. HAYDEN. Then I offer that as an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri insist on the point of order?

Mr. BORLAND. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "interior," in line 21, page 19, insert the following: "And to be reimbursable from any funds now or hereafter placed in the Treasury to the credit of said Indians."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

California.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, having reached "California," I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FOSTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 10385, the Indian appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, Friday, February 4, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of San Diego Harbor, Cal. (H. Doc. No. 648); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting list of documents and files of papers which are not needed or useful in the transaction of current business of the department and have no permanent value or historical interest (H. Doc. No. 649); to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers submitting abstracts of proposals received during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, for materials and labor in connection with works under the Engineer Department (H. Doc. No. 650); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. KEATING, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 655) to pension the survivors of certain Indian wars from 1865 to January, 1891, inclusive, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 115), which said bill and report were



referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. GANDY, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7817) to validate the homestead entry of George S. Clark, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 116), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10537) granting a pension to Peter Harper; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1530) granting a pension to Daniel J. Noonan; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 10749) amending section 3285 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STOUT: A bill (H. R. 10750) permitting the Mondak Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KELLEY: A bill (H. R. 10751) to provide for the purchase of additional land for the erection thereon of an addition to the Federal building at Flint, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 10752) authorizing the establishment of a naval base on the Columbia River, near Astoria, Oreg., and making appropriation for the beginning of construction; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 10753) to entitle accused in criminal cases compulsory process for witnesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10754) to extend the time for filing claims for arrears of pensions under the act approved March 3, 1879; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 10755) to regulate the interstate transportation of immature calves; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10756) to prohibit the slaughter, sale, purchase, shipment, and transportation through interstate commerce of calves and cows under certain conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 10757) to authorize the incorporated town of Juneau, Alaska, to issue bonds for the construction and equipment of schools therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10758) making appropriation for the construction of a jetty and the improvement of Nome Harbor, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10759) making an appropriation for the improvement of Dry Strait, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10760) providing for a survey and removal of the log-jam obstructions to navigation in the Tolovana River, Alaska, and an estimate of the cost of removing the same; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TRIBBLE: A bill (H. R. 10761) to provide capital for agricultural development, to create a standard form of investment based upon farm mortgages, to equalize rates of interest upon farm loans, to furnish a market for United States bonds, to provide a method of applying postal savings deposits to the promotion of the public welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MCCracken: A bill (H. R. 10762) for the improvement of the Columbia River to the mouth of Snake River within the States of Oregon and Washington; for the improvement of the Snake River in the States of Washington and Idaho to Pittsburg Landing, on said river; and for the improvement of the Clearwater River from its mouth to Orofino in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 10763) to extend the provisions of the act of February 8, 1887, as amended, to lands purchased for Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 10764) to amend the naturalization laws; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10765) making an appropriation for improving the harbor at Santa Cruz, Cal.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 10766) providing for the establishment of a term of the district court for the middle district of Tennessee at Winchester, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESHAR: A bill (H. R. 10767) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Almedia Cemetery, in the town of Espy, in the State of Pennsylvania, two bronze cannon or field-pieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KALANIANA'OLE: A bill (H. R. 10768) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 10769) to authorize the issuance of a warrant for the arrest and removal of persons under indictment for offenses against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KITCHIN: A bill (H. R. 10770) to increase the limit of cost of the public building for Wilson, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DAVIS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 10771) to make classifications for military and naval service, to promote preparedness, to provide for adequate and efficient national defense, to require that in all naval and military service of the United States, whether in time of peace or war, wealth shall bear and perform its proportional part of the service, and that money shall be made to fight for its country the same as men; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 10772) to regulate appointments and promotions in the municipal government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 10773) to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 10774) authorizing the Sioux Tribe of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 133) making appropriations for the relief of sufferers from floods in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 134) for the relief of the destitute sufferers from the flood waters in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 135) for the relief of the destitute sufferers from flood waters in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WINGO: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 136) for the relief of the destitute sufferers from flood waters in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. Sisson: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 137) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EMERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 138) to amend the Constitution of the United States so that Congress may pass a national divorce law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 15) to authorize the printing of 50,000 copies of document entitled "Soil Reconnaissance in Alaska"; to the Committee on Printing.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 10775) granting a pension to Lulu M. Lehman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 10776) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Hazlett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10777) granting an increase of pension to Charles Caludius Early; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10778) granting a pension to Mary E. Tanner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 10779) granting a pension to William F. Abshier; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 10780) granting an increase of pension to John T. McCollister; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10781) for the relief of John M. Daniel; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 10782) granting an increase of pension to Daniel S. Kriner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10783) granting a pension to Eliza Speake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10784) granting a pension to Joseph Bessi; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 10785) granting an increase of pension to William B. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10786) granting an increase of pension to William M. Simms; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 10787) granting an increase of pension to John W. Moon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 10788) for the relief of Joseph W. Skill; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10789) for the relief of John A. Ryan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ESTOPINAL: A bill (H. R. 10790) for the relief of Frank Payne Selby; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 10791) for the relief of the occupants of the Tuttle town site; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 10792) for the relief of George F. Nicholson; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10793) granting an increase of pension to Luke R. Ford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10794) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10795) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10796) granting an increase of pension to James Ratchord; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 10797) for the relief of Jacob F. Schild; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 10798) granting an increase of pension to Jay C. Randall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FREEMAN: A bill (H. R. 10799) for the relief of Edward W. Whitaker; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: A bill (H. R. 10800) granting a pension to Mae Crockett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10801) granting a pension to John R. Jordan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 10802) granting an increase of pension to Matthew Farley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLEY: A bill (H. R. 10803) granting an increase of pension to Mary Van Wormer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 10804) granting an increase of pension to John List; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LESHNER: A bill (H. R. 10805) granting a pension to Jacob M. Stratiff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10806) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Lieb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10807) to correct the military record of John Magill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 10808) granting a pension to William D. Swatzell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10809) granting a pension to Tide Owens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10810) granting a pension to Louis F. Pampe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 10811) granting a pension to Marcelle M. Muller, Anthony N. Muller, jr., and Maud Muller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 10812) granting an increase of pension to Lewis A. Rominger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 10813) granting a pension to Mary E. Donham; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10814) for the relief of Andrew B. Ritter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORTH: A bill (H. R. 10815) granting an increase of pension to James C. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10816) granting an increase of pension to John Blose; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 10817) granting an increase of pension to Thomas McCormick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 10818) granting an increase of pension to Angie O. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 10819) granting a pension to Minnie Riffe; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 10820) granting an increase of pension to Druilla E. Barton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEAGALL: A bill (H. R. 10821) granting a pension to Richard C. McGriff; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10822) granting a pension to Leon W. Sims; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10823) for the relief of the Farmers & Merchants Bank, of Headland, Ala.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 10824) granting a pension to Jacob Hicks; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10825) granting a pension to Robert B. Hawkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10826) to complete the military record of Cyrus E. Burnett and for an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 10827) to reimburse the Navajo Timber Co. of Delaware for a deposit made to cover the purchase of timber; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10828) to reimburse the Navajo Lumber & Timber Co. of Arizona for a deposit made to cover the purchase of timber; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific coast, urging appropriations for coast and geodetic survey and the Alaskan railroad; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also (by request), memorial of the Ocean-to-Ocean Highway Association, urging adoption of the Pikes Peak highway as the national highway; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Missouri Grain Dealers' Association, indorsing House bill 4646, the Moss bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Cooper College, Kansas, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), memorial of Sons of American Revolution, of Kentucky, urging building a national-archives building; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of C. H. Riddall, of Pittsburgh, Pa., against prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens in Pennsylvania, against censorship of motion-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of International Union of United Brewery Workmen of America, against increase of tax on beer, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Brief of Dr. Wilbur F. Crafts, of Washington, D. C., for Federal censorship of films; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of F. C. Schoch, George Patchen, William E. Seibel, J. S. Eagan, F. B. Newland, W. H. Dempsey, F. J. Tangher, George Hamilton, L. J. Anderson, Charles L. Kunz, A. C. Hansen, F. C. Sterling, F. A. Miller, Carl Hansen, and E. F. Miller, all of Milwaukee, protesting against the passage of Senate bill 1082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of William Bergenthal Co., D. D. Weschler & Sons, Milwaukee Western Malt Co., Louis Schuette, G. A. Fehrs, George McFarlane, Emil Teitgen, F. T. Zentner, Jacob J. Stangel, Thomas Torrison, Fred Scheutte, Elias Gunnell, Joseph Koenig, Henry Wernecke, Julius Lindstedt, Charles Fechter, Charles Spindler, W. H. Murphy, John P. Reiss, Peter Reiss, J. A. Rummelle, Henry Ritts, and W. C. Dickie, all of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 1082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Jacob Dudenhoefer, Figgee Doyle Co., W. J. Armstrong Co., and Bishop Babcock Co., all of Milwaukee, Wis.,



protesting against the passage of Senate bill 1082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Ernest G. Miller, G. P. Kissinger Co., Adam Billmaur & Co., and Lakeside Distilling Co., all of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 1082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY: Petition of Presbyterian Church of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of Alice E. Wilson and Edward Losson, favoring passage of House bill 9814, relative to purchase of land granted to Oregon & California Railroad; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Quarter Century Society of Port of New York, favoring passage of House bill 9054, relative to sick leave of Government employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petitions of Michael L. Sutter and R. H. Ketcham, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, favoring appropriation for construction of Government railroad in Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, favoring two new vessels for United States Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of E. T. Trotter & Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring tax on dyestuff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, favoring appropriation for two new vessels in United States Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, favoring appropriation for construction of Government railroad in Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of Pittsburgh-Hungarian Political Club, relative to preventing belligerents from interfering with the mails; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNN: Memorial of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, relative to appropriation for carrying on Government railroad in Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, favoring appropriation for two new vessels in United States Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FOCHT: Papers to accompany House bill 9734, for the relief of Hannah J. Stahl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSS: Petition of citizens of Winnetka, Ill., favoring passage of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FREEMAN: Petitions of Boston Store and others, of Norwich; Ernest C. Morse and others, of Putnam; John C. Tracy and others, of Willimantic; N. A. Jordon and others, of Danielson; J. H. Bunce & Co. and others, of Middletown; E. B. Steele and others, of New London, all in the State of Connecticut, favoring tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Holland Manufacturing Co., of Willimantic, Conn., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of Sacramento, Cal., relative to railway mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of United Spanish War Veterans, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial of Pittsburgh Hungarian Political Club, of Pittsburgh, Pa., in favor of the United States providing mail facilities with all countries of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, in favor of an emergency appropriation for the Alaskan railroad; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, in favor of appropriations for the aid of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of Massachusetts rural letter carriers, that 24 miles constitute a standard rural route; that all miles over 24 miles be paid for at the same rate that is taken off for miles less than 24 miles; and that maintenance be allowed for all equip-

ment used on rural routes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GLASS: Petition of business men of Roanoke, Va., in favor of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: Papers to accompany House bill 10527, granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Pitner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: Memorial of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of California, favoring censorship of motion pictures; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Elizabeth Lowe Watson, of Cupertino, Cal., against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. IGOE: Memorial of Kansas City (Mo.) Millers' Club, against the repeal of the mixed-flour law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Missouri Grain Dealers' Association, favoring passage of House bill 4646 for grading of grain; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 1,500 members of International Union of Brewery Workmen, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINKAID: Petitions of citizens of Cushing and Cotesfield, Howard County, Nebr., against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Memorial of Associated Chambers of Commerce of Pacific Coast, indorsing appropriation for United States Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, indorsing appropriation for railroad work in Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LEWIS: Petition of Woodside Methodist Episcopal Church, of Montgomery County, Md., favoring censorship of motion pictures; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of W. J. Sanford and 33 other merchants of Big Rapids, Mich., against House bill 967—the Stephens bill—to prevent discrimination in prices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McLEMORE: Petitions of District Unions of Farmers' Educational Cooperative Union of Texas against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEEKER: Petitions of Sheet Metal Workers' Union, local No. 349; Building Trades Council; International Union of Steam Operating Engineers, local No. 315; International Brotherhood of Boiler Makers, Iron Ship Builders, and Helpers, local No. 276; Travelers' Protective Association; Tobacco Workers' International Union, local No. 1; Web Printing Pressmen's Union, No. 2; United Upholsterers' Union of St. Louis and Vicinity, local No. 21; Beer Drivers' and Stablemen's Union, No. 43; International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen, and Helpers, local No. 405; Switchmen's Union, lodge No. 54; International Moulders' Union, No. 59, all of St. Louis, Mo.; and a number of citizens of St. Louis and vicinity, praying for the passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MOON: Papers to accompany a bill for the relief of Lewis A. Rominger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORIN (by request): Petition of W. T. Hornaday, in favor of the Hayden bill; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also (by request), memorial of Triangle Film Corporation, against the Hughes-Smith Federal motion-picture censorship bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also (by request), memorial of New York Zoological Society of New York, favoring converting any or all forest reserves into game refuges; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also (by request), petition of D. W. Northrup, secretary of Robert N. Basse Co., of Derby, Conn., indorsing the plans of the General Staff of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of Horace A. Reeves, jr., of Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of the Small pilotage bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NORTON: Resolution by the Minot (N. Dak.) Association of Commerce, protesting against the imposition of a Federal tax on gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution adopted by the Sixth District Medical Society, Bismarck, N. Dak., favoring the making of adequate provision in the reorganization of the Army for a sufficient number of medical officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OAKLEY: Petition of Rattan Manufacturing Co., of New Britain, favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: Petition of C. A. Smith and 28 others, of Baldwinsville, Mass., in favor of House bill 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROWE: Memorial of Travelers' Protective Association of America, in favor of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Jessup & Moore Paper Co., of New York City, in favor of the Small pilotage bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the department of social betterment of the Brooklyn (N. Y.) Board of Charities, in favor of the Kern-McGillicuddy bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Edwin H. Burr, of New York City, protesting against any curtailment of mail deliveries in New York City; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Carroll Council, No. 321, Knights of Columbus, of Brooklyn, N. Y., in favor of making October 12, Columbus Day, a legal holiday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SCULLY: Memorial of Crystal Wave Council, No. 54, of North Long Branch, N. J., favoring the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of Freedom Council, No. 36, Daughters of Liberty, of Keyport, N. J., in favor of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of U. C. Rose, of South River, N. J., in favor of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Associated Chamber of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, in favor of an appropriation to aid the Alaskan railroad; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, in favor of an appropriation to aid the Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Pittsburgh Hungarian Political Club, of Pittsburgh, Pa., in favor of the United States taking steps to secure mail service with all countries of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEELE of Iowa: Petitions of St. Marys Church and Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Storm Lake, Iowa, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of citizens of Gayly, Pa., favoring abolishing polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VARE: Memorial of Philadelphia Board of Trade, favoring Senate joint resolution 60, creating joint subcommittee to amend present interstate-commerce law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.